



NEW ACADEMY OF THE IMMACULATE HEART, FRAZER, PENNA.

THE BALLINGER COMPANY
Successor to
BALLINGER & PERROT
ARCHITECTS

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XLVI.—APRIL, 1921—NO. 182.

THE CHURCH AND THE ABUSE OF INDULGENCES IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

AMONG the almost countless charges directed against the Church during the past 400 years to discredit her mission and to justify the rebellion of the sixteenth century, the allegation that she inaugurated and fostered the practice commonly known in enemy circles as the sale of indulgences, has done good service and contributed much to the propaganda of calumny and misrepresentation. Nor can it be said that its life of usefulness in this direction is waning. On the contrary, one needs only to cast a cursory glance over the denominational literature of the past two or three years to be satisfied that in the midst of a mass of untruth and intellectual rubbish, it stands out to-day as prominently and tenaciously, as vitally and energetically, as it stood in the days when it was launched and sent forth to prop up a bad cause. Some one, actuated more by truth than poetry, has called it an intellectual scare-crow, erected by pride and moral depravity in the arena of history to sentinel the path that leads to Rome and to serve as a warning to the passer-by of the moral disintegration of the old ecclesiastical order.

Be that as it may, the charge that the Church inaugurated and encouraged the practice falls to pieces in the light of history. That indulgences were abused, even to the extent of being put on the market and sold as it were to the highest bidder, is a fact from which by no historical subterfuge we can escape. No one familiar with the period will deny the deep-seated moral deterioration of the mediæval Church. It required no prophet of exceptional foresight

to see disaster ahead. A continuance of the conditions that prevailed at the beginning of the sixteenth century was clearly impossible. Abuses were great, but they were more than that—they had become in many respects intolerable. Nevertheless, in spite of the moral apostasy that was everywhere rampant, no one who studies the period with an unprejudiced mind will admit that the yawning chasm that was created by Luther and his satellites followed as an inevitable result of that apostasy. Moral corruption, no doubt, played a prominent part, but it merely facilitated the creation. Indulgences were abused, but that abuse was not, as superficial writers would have it, the cause, but only the immediate occasion of the revolt. When men, proud and degenerate, refuse to bring their lives into harmonious relations with the teachings and requirements of the Church, there is no alternative left to their sense of self-justification, but to deny the authority of the Church and attribute their defection not to their own inherent corruption, but rather to what they are pleased to call the hopeless corruption of the Church.

In the following study the aim will be to consider briefly, from notes gathered while working along other lines, the primary agencies and circumstances of the abuses usually connected with indulgences, and incidentally, to point out that the Church, so far from concurring in or regarding the traffic as a legitimate custom, never ceased to combat it through her Bishops and synods and finally suppressed it. In doing so, it is needless to say, only such indulgences will be considered which were granted for almsgiving, that is, those the gaining of which was conditioned by a monetary consideration for a specified object, for these alone furnished sufficient latitude for abuse.

I.

The beginning of the abuse of indulgences must be looked for during the latter half of the Middle Ages. Throughout the first ten centuries of the Church there is no record of a single definitely defined indulgence, either plenary or partial, in the form in which we have them to-day. This does not mean that the indulgence during that period had no existence. Stripped of its accidental features, an indulgence is nothing more nor less than a commutation by competent authority of a more rigorous penitential discipline to one that is less so,¹ and as such the indulgence is as old as the Church, though the form of its concession varied according

¹ Cfr. Albertus Magnus, *Com. in 4 Sent. librum, Dist. 20, art. 16.* Magistri definiunt relaxationem sic: Relaxatio (indulgentia) est satisfactionis majoris in minorem competens et discreta commutatio.

as new conditions arose. In II. Cor. xi., 5-10, we have all the essentials of a true indulgence. The identity of the *libellus pacis* of the early martyrs with the granting of a true indulgence is unquestionable and is recognized even by the Protestant theologian, Karl Müller.² After the persecutions it became a rule that Bishops could exercise their power in dispensing from a part of the canonical penance, especially towards those who were faithful in the performance of it. The middle of the seventh century saw the origin in Ireland and England of the so-called redemptions,³ which consisted in the commutation of long and rigorous penances to works of a milder character, especially prayer and almsdeeds. By almsdeeds here is understood the giving of a certain sum of money for a good purpose. At first this commutation was made in individual cases by the priest in the confessional. Later on it became the custom to grant it *generally* by the Bishops outside of sacramental confession. This system finally found its way to the continent and became the universally adopted method of granting indulgences. It prevailed well into the eleventh century, when, owing to changed conditions, it gave way to the practice of granting indulgences in the form in vogue to-day—the Church stating exactly by how many days or years she would abbreviate penitential obligations.⁴

In any treatment of the abuse of indulgences, or for that matter in any treatment of indulgences granted for alms from the close of the eleventh century to the Council of Trent, there are a few facts that must be borne in mind if we would do justice to these spiritual grants, understand their abuse and interpret aright their place and influence in mediæval life. In the first place, man possesses an

² Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch. XVI. (1896) 201. Cfr. also Kirsch, "The Communion of Saints in the Ancient Church" (St. Louis, 1911), 96-106.

³ Muratori (Antiq. ital. III., 358), strange to say, overlooked the fact that for the validity of these redemptions true repentance was a necessary condition. According to him they were nothing more than a material tax, of no value in foro Dei; yet he admits (op. cit. V., 765) eas (redemptiones) invehere necesse fuit, neque enim homines tam diuturnas et graves corporis afflictiones sustinere poterant.

⁴ The history of indulgences is still a work of the future. The best account of the subject in English is Lepicier: "Indulgences, Their Origin, Nature and Development," London, 1906. Of very special historical interest are the following articles by the learned Dr. N. Paulus of Munich: "Die Anfänge des Ablasswesens," Hist.-polit. Blätter, CXXXVIII. (1906), 550-64; "Brückenablässe," id. CLI. (1913), 916-31; CLII. (1913), 20-36; "Ablässe für gemeinnützige Zwecke," id. CLIII. (1914), 561-75, 657-73; "Die Ablässe der röm. Kirchen im M-A," id. CLV. (1915), 225-41, 316-26; "Die Ablässe der röm. Kirchen vor Innocenz III.," Hist. Jahrbuch d. Görresgesellschaft, XXVIII. (1907), 1-8; "Der Hauptschädling des Ablasses im M-A," id. XXXV. (1914), 510-42; "Berühmte, doch unechte Ablässe," id. XXXVI. (1915), 481-515; "Der Ablass für die Verstorbenen im M-A," Zeitschr. f. Kath. Theologie, XXIV. (Innsbruck, 1900), 1-36, 249-66; "Die älteste Ablässe für Almosen und Kirchenbesuch," id. XXXIII. (1909), 1-40, 281-319; "Die Ablasslehre der Frühscholastik," id. XXXIV. (1910), 433-72; "Die Anfänge des sogenannten Ablasses von Schuld u. Strafe," id. XXXVI. (1912), 67-96; "Der sogenannte Ablass von Schuld u. Strafe im späteren M-A," XXXVI. (1912), 252-79; "Die Ablässe der Kreuzwegandacht," Theologie u. Glaube (1913); "Die Anfänge des Sterbeablasses," id. (1914).

almost infinite capacity for abusing good, it matters not whether that good be human or divine. History stands witness how in all ages of Christianity men, impelled by greed, have sullied the beauty of God's works and diverted into desecrating channels the benefits accruing therefrom. For avarice lives and moves in a world of material standards. It recognizes no sacredness. And the avarice which went hand in hand with violence under the feudal system, blushed not to traffic in indulgences as it trafficked in benefices and canonries.

Then again, there were the almost unlimited purposes for which indulgences were granted during that period. This is true especially of those the gaining of which was conditioned by the payment of a certain sum of money for a specified object.⁵ Volumes have been written on the unrivaled architecture of the Middle Ages—those stately cathedrals and sanctuaries that stand even to-day as the apogee of artistic genius; yet it is to the liberal grant of indulgences by Popes and Bishops that we owe these monuments of Christian devotion. Churches, monasteries, schools, hospitals and houses of refuge sprang up oftener under the inspiration of such spiritual favors than by any other reward in the gift of man. Was a church or hospital or some other institution of charity to be built or repaired, an indulgence was granted to all who contributed financially towards its construction or restoration.⁶ Nor was the Church neglectful of the temporal well-being of her children. By drawing upon her spiritual treasures she promoted works which to-day are regarded as of a purely public and semi-public character—the construction of bridges, public highways and causeways, dams, harbors, fortifications, colonization enterprises, the organization of guilds, the institution of the truce of God and so on. For the ransom of those Christians who had fallen into the hands of infidels and were reduced to the state of slavery, two religious

⁵ Purely devotional indulgences were granted on such occasions as the consecration of a church, the observance of vigils, the festivals of saints, the translation of relics, pilgrimages etc. They were granted for the recitation of certain prayers, visiting certain churches, attending sermons of certain preachers, taking up arms against infidels. Innocent III. (Raynaldus, ad an. 1198, N. 38 and Amort, p. I., 156) granted an indulgence of ten days to all who should marry prostitutes, that these might abandon their evil ways and cease to be an occasion of sin.

⁶ It may be of interest to note here that indulgences were granted to all who contributed building material—stone, sand, lumber, etc. Often, too, they were granted for hauling the material (Urkundenbuch d. Stadt Strassburg I., No. 171). Again they were granted for personal labor. Usually an indulgence of forty days was granted for a day's work. Bishop Dietrich of Brandenburg granted an indulgence of ten days to those who worked four hours on the afternoons of Sundays and holydays. Workmen gave freely of their labor's best, and if their zeal or the charity of the faithful seemed to spell exhaustion, the doubling of an indulgence was sufficient to revive them. Paulus, Hist.-polit. Blätter CLI., 916-31; CLII., 20-36; CLIII., 561-75, 657-73. Michael, Gesch. d. Volkes V. (Freiburg, 1911) 42sq.

orders were founded—the Trinitarians and Mercedarians. In order to obtain the necessary funds to carry on their work the Popes provided them with indulgences which they offered to the faithful in exchange for financial aid. Even individual persons, a member or members of whose family had been taken captive and whose means did not suffice to pay the ransom, received from the Popes similar indulgences.⁷ Every work or enterprise that contributed to the spiritual and temporal welfare of the people was encouraged by the grant of indulgences and the faithful on their part were ever ready to avail themselves of these spiritual opportunities.

To those not conversant with mediæval life and institutions, it will, no doubt, come as a matter of surprise that indulgences should have been so multiplied, and this, too, in favor of works which must be regarded as of a purely temporal nature. But it must be remembered that the Middle Ages were above all else ages of faith—a faith that created ideals and crowned endeavors. Religion was the power underlying action. It colored and transfigured all the phenomena of social life. Its spirit and aims had so interpenetrated the popular life that the temporal served only when it served the spiritual. These two facts—the amalgamation of spiritual and temporal interests, and the enormous part indulgences played in mediæval life, must above all others be borne in mind in any consideration of indulgences during that period.

The principle that actuated the Church in rewarding the faithful by spiritual favors for their contributions to the temporal needs of society needs no justification. The idea that almsgiving is most acceptable to God, that it liberates from sin and its punishment, is coeval with the recognition of sin, its consequences and divine mercy. It is a work of penance frequently recommended in Holy Scripture. The Fathers of the Church unequivocally inculcate its necessity. The numerous registers of gifts that have come down to us from the early Middle Ages, testify how deeply the faithful of that period were imbued with the idea that by alms and contributions to the erection and repair of churches and monasteries and works of a public or semi-public character, they could the more easily obtain God's favor and pardon. Hence, if the Church has the right to grant indulgences for all kinds of good works performed by the faithful, she has *a fortiori* the right to grant them for pecuniary contributions when these are intended and given for a good purpose. St. Thomas says, for a purely temporal purpose indul-

⁷ Mollat, *Lettres communes de Jean XXII.*, T. I. (Paris, 1904), No. 4558, 4559.

gences cannot be granted, but only in so far as the temporal serves the spiritual.⁸

The institutions in whose favor such grants were made were naturally not a little concerned in their publication beyond immediate localities. Thus, when in 1118 Alphonso I. of Aragon recovered from the Saracens the city of Saragossa, Pope Galesius II., besides granting a plenary indulgence to the Christian soldiers of Spain who should fall in battle against the infidels, granted a partial indulgence, the amount of which he left to the discretion of the Bishops, to all who should by their alms contribute towards the restoration of the church of Saragossa. Petro de Librana, Bishop of Saragossa, at once gave this indulgence the widest possible publication. Not only did he address a letter to the Catholics of the world, but he also sent abroad preachers, among them his arch-deacon, Miorrand, to make known to the people the wretched state of his church, to appeal to their generosity by preaching the indulgence and to collect the alms.⁹

This is by no means an isolated instance, nor one out of a few; it is but one out of many thousands. It was *the* method for collecting funds that seems to have gained general acceptance in the early part of the twelfth century, and though it became the object of bitter denunciation in the course of time, it continued to prevail well into the sixteenth century—prevailed, in fact, till it was abolished by the Council of Trent.

Indulgences for alms, that is, for pecuniary contributions to pious undertakings, were granted during the eleventh century, though instances of such grants were undoubtedly rare. The practice, however, of sending out preachers to promulgate such indulgences and to collect the alms, originated in all probability in the beginning of the twelfth century. The earliest known example of this kind is that of the Benedictine Goffrid, of the Abbey of Croyland in Lincolnshire, England. Upon his election as abbot in 1109 he decided to rebuild the monastery which had been destroyed by fire in 1091. To this purpose the Bishops granted to all who should contribute towards the reconstruction the remission of a third of their penance. To make known the indulgence and to collect the

⁸ Temporalia ad spiritualia ordinantur; quia propter spiritualia debemus uti temporalibus. Et ideo pro temporalibus simpliciter non potest fieri indulgentia, sed pro temporalibus ordinatis ad spiritualia; sicut est repressio inimicorum ecclesiae, qui pacem ecclesiae perturbant, vel sicut constructio ecclesiarum et pontium et aliarum eleemosynarum largitio. Suppl. q. XXV., art. iii.

⁹ Migne, P. L. CLXIII., 508; Mansi, XXI., 169sq; Baronius, ad an. 1118, No. 18, 19.

alms the abbot sent his monks not only throughout England, Ireland and Scotland, but also to Flanders and France.¹⁰

This method of collecting funds applied at first only to churches and monasteries; gradually, however, it received a wider application with the rise of the numerous military and hospitaler orders which devoted themselves to various works of charity and to the defense of the Church against the encroachments of the infidels. It is not necessary to wander far into the field of twelfth century literature to learn how numerous were the indulgences granted in the interest of works undertaken by these orders.¹¹ "The finest result of the religious spirit in the Middle Ages was to produce that disinterested enthusiasm which, as soon as some distress of humanity became flagrant, immediately created societies for help and rendered self-denial popular."¹² Religious associations, too, whose aims and purposes were apparently of a purely temporal nature, were made the recipients of spiritual favors which served as a means of securing funds to carry on their work. For in those days there were no committees of ways and means, no State or municipal budgets on which could be drawn to defray the expenses of extensive public construction. Most prominent among these organizations, were, no doubt the *Fratres pontifices*, or the Bridge-building Brotherhood. Their work represented and was regarded by all a true charity for certain unfortunate people, namely, travelers. Remnants of bridges constructed by this association are to be seen even at this late day in western Europe, especially in southern France. When in 1220 Frederick II. decided to replace the wooden bridge that spanned the river Danube at Donauworth, he took the almsgatherers in his protection and provided them with letters of recommendation, while Bishop Heinrich of Eichstatt granted an indulgence of thirty days to all who should contribute by money or labor.¹³

¹⁰ Mabillon, *Annales ord. S. Benedicti V.* (Paris, 1713), 538. We leave out of consideration in this study those preachers and almsgatherers who were appointed for and worked in the interests of the crusades. While they, too, were often the cause of grave scandals, yet they do not belong to that class of almsgatherers which we are considering here. In the Papal Bulls, too, we often find a distinction drawn between the preachers of crusades and the "quaestores." The interests of the Orient are more important and more urgent than all local interests. Hence the crusade preacher takes precedence over the "quaestores." Should it happen that both in the course of their work meet, there are Papal documents to show that the former had authority to silence the latter. Cfr. *Hist. Jahrb.* XXXV., 510sq. We leave out of consideration here also those almsgatherers of the mendicant orders known as *Terminarii*. These had no indulgence to promulgate.

¹¹ Ratzinger, *Gesch. d. kirchlichen Armenpflege* (Freiburg, 1884). Lallemand, *Histoire de la Charité* (Paris, 1906).

¹² Jusserand: "English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages," tr. (London, 1909) 38.

¹³ Lefflad, "Regesten der Bischöfe von Eichstätt," II. (Eichstätt, 1874), 2. Michael, op. cit. I., 170-73.

Those who were entrusted with the mission to preach indulgences and collect the alms were officially known as *quaestores*, *quaestuarii* or *quaestuarii*, from *quaerere*, *quaestare*, *quaesturare*, and were usually provided by the Pope or the Bishops by whom they were sent with letters of authorization, which always stated the nature of the indulgence offered and the purpose for which it was granted. In English literature they are more commonly known as "pardoners"; an appellation not altogether unfamiliar when we recall the amusing portrait that has come down to us in the "Canterbury Tales." Chaucer's description of the

. . . gentil pardoner
Of Rouncival . . .
That streyt was comen from the court of Rome,

whose

. . . walet lay byforn him in his lappe,
Bret-ful of pardoun come from Rome al hoot.

who

. . . in his male hadde a pilwebeer,
Which that, he seide, was oure lady veyl;
He seide, he hadde a gobet of the seyl
That seynt Peter hadde, when that he wente
Uppon the see, til Jhesu Christ him hente.
He hadde a croys of latoun ful of stones,
And in a glas he hadde pigges bones.

to-day seems extraordinary, so much so that we wonder whether he did not in a moment of poetic ecstasy exceed the limits of reality and depict an entity more or less fictitious. Revolting though they may be to our pious orthodoxy, the poet's characterizations are, however, far from overdrawn, and a careful study of the documents relative to the subject shows that they contain not a single trait that may not be verified by synodal decrees and by letters emanating from Papal and episcopal chanceries. These gatherers of alms in exchange for indulgences were not always in the exercise of their profession confined within the territorial limits of a single diocese, nor of several dioceses for that matter; very often such collections were authorized without any specified territorial limitations; sometimes, too, the authorization stated expressly *per ecclesiam occidentalem*, or *per ecclesiam universam*. In this manner large sums of money were collected, and not infrequently by men who possessed little sense of honesty and less of responsibility. But irrespective of territorial extent, the profession of a "quaestor" or "pardoner" was a lucrative one; there was great competition, hence, recourse was often had to methods as sordid and as despicable as they were immoral and shameless. Then, too, the success of the authorized "quaestores" enticed from his lair the

charlatan, the vagabond and the impostor, who plied the trade with a cunning and a persistency worthy of the *potestates tenebrarum*, and left in their unholy trail nothing but the abominations of unscrupulous traffickers—counterfeit wares.

As was stated above, a proper estimate of the misdeeds of the “quaestores” and the methods employed by them for speculating in the public confidence is best obtained by a careful exploration of the decrees and ordinances issued against them by ecclesiastical authorities. The earliest instrument of this kind of which we have any record is a writing of Innocent III., dated December 9, 1198, and addressed to Archbishop Absalon of Lund, Denmark. The Archbishop while in Rome made complaint against the “quaestores” of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, which like other religious associations of the time was allowed an unlimited territory in its quest of alms. The “quaestores,” the prelate complained, are illiterate members of the order—lay-Brothers—some of whom, being unable to cover the territory assigned to them, do not hesitate on their own authority to delegate others as helpmates, priests and laymen, among the latter being men of loose life who through bacchanalian revelries and other dishonorable behavior are the cause of great scandal. In reply the Pope commanded that these subordinate “quaestores” who went about the country wearing the livery of the order, as also those who had engaged them, be forbidden to gather any more alms. Those also of the Brothers who, in default of episcopal sanction, had arrogated to themselves all kinds of authority, were to be severely reprimanded.¹⁴

When we recall that the office of the “quaestor” was to promulgate the indulgence by preaching and to collect the alms, it will, no doubt, be a matter of surprise to those not conversant with mediæval Church history, to learn that the office should have been entrusted to illiterate lay-members of an order, or even to educated laymen, to say nothing of that class of the laity whose intellectual equipment, at least so far as doctrinal values are concerned, did not rise above the level of the *mens vacua*.¹⁵ If not all, certainly the principal heresies of the Middle Ages were animated by a spirit of anti-sacerdotalism. Their abolition of the distinction between hierarchy and laity, between clergy and people, was not without its disintegrating influence on the Catholic people, an

¹⁴ Migne, P. L. CCXIV., 425sq. Paulus, op. cit. 514.

¹⁵ The general chapter of the Dominicans in 1234 forbade its members to interfere with the “quaestores” of the Hospital Brothers of St. Anthony when these complied with the provisions of the Fourth Lateran Council. From Bonanni, *Ordinum religiosorum Catalogus* (Romae, 1722), we learn that these “quaestores” too were “laici quidam.” The work of Bonanni was inaccessible to me. Cfr. *Acta Cap. Gen. Ord. Praed. I.* (ed. Reichert, Romae, 1898), 4.

influence all the more powerful when we recall to what degree preaching had been neglected by the clergy.¹⁶ There was a tendency in certain quarters to give to the Church a larger degree of democracy, a tendency, it is true, that was encouraged principally by the sects, but which also found within the Church men and women who arrogated to themselves the distinctive rights and privileges of the clergy and made bold to deliver their sermons in public.¹⁷ This does not mean that the official "quaestores" were as a rule of the laity. On the contrary, these formed the exception, and their appointment was usually due to the greed of one higher up. But as every lucrative trade has its shams and imitations, so there was no dearth of almsgatherers who went under false names, carried false papers and who worked for no one but their own interests. The official "quaestores" were as a rule chosen from the clergy; and while many of these regarded the office as sacred and conducted themselves accordingly, many, too, were in it for all they could get out of it, regardless of the morality or immorality of the methods employed. It was, no doubt, because of the odium that had come to be attached to the office that the synod of Paris in 1213, presided over by the Cardinal Legate, Robert de Courcon, strictly forbade the clergy to identify themselves in any way with the work of the "quaestores." Not only that, but should any present themselves at any church within the province they must produce satisfactory episcopal authorization, and not until their reputation was fully established as irreproachable was permission to preach to be granted them.¹⁸ About fifteen years earlier we find among the *Constitutiones synodicae* of Eudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris from 1196 to 1208, more vigorous measures against them. Among other restrictions they were forbidden to preach or even to make known this mission to the people. This was to be done by the pastor. They were also forbidden to say Mass on relics of saints or on any receptacle containing relics.

¹⁶ Humbertus de Romanis, O. P. says: *Parvuli petierunt panem et non erat qui frangeret eis, scil. nec sacerdos, nec, archidiaconus, nec episcopus (de eruditione praedicatorum, lib. I., cap. 21).*

¹⁷ The abuse was condemned by Innocent III. in 1199 after he had been informed by the Bishop of Metz of the large proportions it had assumed (C. 12. X. de haeret. V. 7). In 1235 Gregory IX. renewed the condemnation (C. 14. X. de haeret. V. 7). In 1210 Innocent III. wrote to the Abbot of the Cistercian monastery at Morimond in Lothringia: *nova quaedam nostris sunt aurius intimata, quod abbatissae moniales proprias benedicunt, ipsarum quoque confessiones in criminibus audiunt, et legentes evangelium praesumunt publice praedicare. Cum igitur id absonum sit pariter et absurdum mandamus, quatenus, ne id de cetero fiat, curetis firmiter inhibere, etc. (C. 10. X. de poenit. V. 38).*

¹⁸ Mansi, XXII., 621. Finke, *Concilienstudien* 2, *Gesch. des 13 Jahrh.* (Münster, 1891), 45.

Likewise were they forbidden to parade the streets ringing a little bell and exhibiting relics.¹⁹

Against those "quaestores" who went about under false names, who had recourse in their sermons to every conceivable device a depraved ingenuity could invent to win their hearers and whose conduct was scandalous in the extreme, the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 decreed—a decree, by the way, that served as the basis for similar action by numerous provincial and diocesan synods during the entire thirteenth century—that henceforth no one was to be recognized as a "quaestor" who could not present *Apostolicas vel diocesani Episcopi literas veras*. To these, moreover, who could furnish the required credentials, permission to preach was to be denied and their appeal to the people limited to the bare reading of the letters of authorization. In addition, the Council warned these almsgatherers in the most definite terms against scandals. They were not to pass the night at taverns in drunken carousals nor in houses of a questionable character. Warned they were likewise against donning the habit of a religious order, thinking by such deception to draw the people more easily into their iniquitous nets.²⁰

In spite, however, of the action taken by councils and synods, the evil, so far from being checked, much less reduced, rather assumed larger proportions, and more drastic measures of procedure were found imperative. The "quaestores" had a right to a certain percentage of the alms collected; and so long as the same right extended also to the clergy in whose parishes the "quaestores" operated, there was little relief in sight until action of some sort had been taken equally against those of the clergy who were in collusion with the malefactors. To check the misdeeds of both more effectually, therefore, than had hitherto been done, the provincial synod of Mainz in 1233 decided that in the future the "quaestores" as such were to be denied every appearance in the church, and those of the clergy who, contrary to this decree, should admit them would incur suspension. Should a Bishop for a good reason permit a collection to be taken in his diocese, those entrusted with the task were under no condition to be permitted in the church. Their mission as well as the contents of their letters of authorization were to be made known to the people by the pastor

¹⁹ Mansi, XXII., 681. Much after the fashion of our modern itinerant nuisances these peddlers of indulgences often paraded the streets ringing a bell. In addition to indulgences they were provided with relics which they exhibited for alms. They stationed themselves in open places where, having attracted a crowd with the aid of the bell, they would with all the stentorian antics of a twentieth century fakir expatiate on the extraordinary quality of their wares.

²⁰ Mansi, XXII., 1049. In the same chapter (62) the Council drew up a regular form to be used in letters of Papal authorization.

himself. They were forbidden to celebrate Mass on the relics of saints, or to wander through the streets ringing a bell for purpose of exhibiting relics.²¹

Eleven years later (1244) another council of Mainz (Fritzlar) took up the matter and proceeded against them still more rigorously. "The 'quaestores' claim to be provided with letters of authorization by the Pope and other prelates, and since many of the clergy cannot distinguish between genuine and fabricated documents, the council insists that no almsgatherer be admitted into any parish until his papers have been examined and their validity certified to in writing by the Ordinary of the diocese. Any infringement of this statute by the clergy will be followed *ipso facto* by three years' suspension. Those, however, who undertake to make collections without written episcopal sanction, are to be arrested by the secular authorities and handed over to the episcopal tribunal."²²

The bitterest excommunication of the unholy tribe and the most drastic action against them during the thirteenth century was, no doubt, that of the provincial synod of Mainz in 1261. Confronted by a situation that had seemingly become intolerable and with a full realization of the gravity of the abuses, the synod enumerates in detail some of the most flagrant excesses to which these itinerant swindlers had carried their nefarious work. "By their monstrous abuse in the pursuit of the *turpis quaestus*," says the synod, "they have become an object of hatred the world over; human pests whose abominations have made them so abominable that the complaint of every tongue rises up against them; and who, possessing only a modicum of divine faith, would not hate them whose every way is perverse and whose every step is inspired by the devil? Habituated to every evil, they are *fabricatores mendacii et figuli falsitatis*, whose tongues utter naught but lies of their own creation. These wretches often exhibit as sacred relics common bones of men or brutes (*pro reliquiis saepe exponunt ossa profana hominum seu brutorum*), they narrate fantastic tales and seek by means of prevarication, hypocritical tears and gestures, and exaggerated facial contortions to arouse the sympathy of the people in their behalf. *Contra statutum generalis concilii* (Fourth Lateran Council) they offer such a multitude of indulgences that scarcely any one, even of those who know their infamy, is able to resist their appeals. The result is that the Church's power of the Keys is despised and her penitential discipline weakened, for on the plea that their sins have been remitted by indulgences (*asserentes se a peccatis per hujusmodi*

²¹ Mansi, XXIII., 1085. Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae*, III., 600. The statutes of this council with an historical introduction are to be found also in *Zeitschr. f. die Gesch. d. Oberrheins*, III. (1852), 129-42.

²² Mansi, XXIII., 730. Hartzheim, III., 575. Finke, *op. cit.* 24-29.

indulgentias absolutos)²³ few care to perform the penance enjoined by the confessor. Over and above this, there is the illegitimate use these 'quæstores' make of the money thus collected, a use which renders them guilty not so much of the crime of theft as of sacrilege. For, having been collected ostensibly for a religious purpose, they squander it in banquets, in drinking-bouts, in sports and debaucheries. Wherefore," concludes the synod, "these pestiferous people who are corrupting the whole country are forever banished from our province. No one is to receive them and should they show themselves anywhere, let them be arrested and handed over to the episcopal tribunal. Orders, like the Hospitalers of St. Anthony, that are accustomed to take a collection every year, are not to entrust this work to strangers, but it must be done by their own Brothers. The Brothers, moreover, are forbidden personally to present their petition to the people; this must be done by the local pastors, without a sermon and without the ringing of a bell. Should a church within a diocese with the permission of the Bishop desire to take up a collection, the petition together with the indulgences granted are to be sent to the pastors, who will collect the alms and faithfully forward the same to the church. In gathering alms every diocese, too, should limit itself to its own diocesan territory and not extend its operations into the territory of a neighboring diocese."²⁴

This declaration of the synod gives us a fairly good idea of some of the practices of those mediæval indulgence preachers of whom we have heard so much and yet so little. We say some, for the synod makes no attempt to enumerate all. Possessing a singular knowledge of the human heart, these preachers knew how to turn to their own account the religiously emotional temperament of the people. Themselves unscrupulous, they knew how to profit by the scruples of others. They fabricated indulgences and credentials, even Papal Bulls, why should they regard their powers less limited in the matter of relics? If Chaucer's pardoner possessed a piece of the sail of Peter's boat, Boccaccio's Fra Cipolla went him one better when he told his hearers: "I will, as an especial favor, show you a vèry holy and goodly relic, which I myself brought aforetime from the Holy Land beyond seas, and that is one of the Angel Gabriel's feathers, which remained in the Virgin Mary's chamber, when he came to announce to her in Nazareth."²⁵ The story of

²³ Here is meant the remission of sin "*quoad poenam*," not "*quoad culpam*."

²⁴ Mansi, XXIII., 1102. Hartzheim, III., 612.

²⁵ "The Decameron of Giovanni Boccaccio," tr. by John Payne, (London, 1886), II., 280, 287. This work was inaccessible to me. I am quoting from Jusserant, *op. cit.* 326. On wandering preachers and false relics, *cfr.* Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire Francaise au moyen-age*, (Paris, 1886), 36 sqq.

the Chaucerian having in a glass "pigges bones," we were perhaps inclined to treat as a poet's jest; the words of the synod, however, leave no doubt that the poet was not so very far from the truth after all.

A provincial council of Scotland restricted the admission of the almsgatherer into the church to once in the course of the year, when his mission was to be explained to the people by the parish priest.²⁶

From a decision of the diocesan synod held at Sankt Pöltsen in 1284 and presided over by Bishop Gottfried of Passau, we learn that the "quaestores," to carry on their work more systematically, had formed regular associations.²⁷ These were bodies of organized professionals, mostly clerics—genuine and counterfeit, orthodox and heterodox, often going about in the habit of a religious order, yet members of no order, full of devotion, yet a devotion that was not their own—drawn largely from that species of flotsam and jetsam which the Middle Ages christened *clerici vagi*, *vagabundi*, *Goliardi*, *Eberhardini*. They hired out and worked for a certain percentage of the alms collected. Not unfrequently, too, churches and other institutions that possessed the right to gather alms in exchange for indulgences would for a certain sum of money transfer or sell that right to such an association. The scandalous results of such transactions can easily be imagined. Traces of such organizations we find as early as the first years of the thirteenth century. The provincial synod of Paris (1213), for instance, referred to above, forbade collections to be handed over to members of such associations.

In 1287 a synod of Liege ordained: *Decani et presbyteri non emant de quaestuariis futuros proventus seu quaestus faciendos*. The synod then strictly prohibits preaching by the "quaestores" in the church, in the streets or in any other public place. Neither are they to go from house to house to dispose of their indulgences. Infringement of these rules was to be punished with excommunication. Pastors, too, are called upon to warn the faithful against them every Sunday and holyday and to forbid them under pain of excommunication to attend their sermons. The wishes of reputable and duly authorized "quaestores" must be made known to the people by the pastor, but, adds the synod, the pastor is not to retain any portion of the alms collected.²⁸

In the same year the synods of Exeter and Milan occupy themselves with the doings of these wandering preachers. Exeter complains that they overstate the number and amount of their indul-

²⁶ Bellesheim-Blair: "History of the Catholic Church in Scotland," I. (London, 1887), 348. Finke: op. cit. 52.

²⁷ Mansi, XXIV., 505. Hartzheim, III., 674.

²⁸ Mansi, XXIV., 937. Hartzheim, III., 719

gences. In this way they mislead the simple people to spend large sums of money which they (the preachers) then squander in drunkenness and debaucheries. The result is that true and beneficial indulgences are neglected and despised.²⁹ The synod of Milan, after forbidding them to preach without permission, adopts a novel course to enforce its decision. Any one may take, even forcibly, from the party violating this rule all the money thus collected and retain it for his own use.³⁰

The synods thus far referred to constitute but a few of the large number that during the thirteenth century found themselves obliged to deal with an evil that had become a menace to the Church in more respects than one. In every country of Europe the almsgatherers enjoyed the same reputation, and in every country, too, councils and synods raised their voices in condemnation of them and their methods. In addition to those already mentioned, reference might be made to the synods of Rouen (1214),³¹ Trier (1227),³² Tarragona (1239),³³ Beziers (1246),³⁴ Paris (1248),³⁵ Strassburg (1252),³⁶ Bordeaux (1255),³⁷ Montpellier (1258),³⁸ Salzburg (1274 and 1291),³⁹ and Poitiers (1280).⁴⁰

No less denunciatory than the synods are the allusions of leading men. Jacques de Vitry, with the fiery determination so characteristic of him, hurls his disgust in unmeasured terms not only against those worthless creatures who wander about with false relics, who absolve sinners from all penitential obligations, and seek by every crooked means to gain their money, which they then spend in drunkenness and debaucheries, but also against Bishops who provide them with recommendatory letters and against the clergy who, being sharers in their collections, are abettors of their infamous trade. He directs his invectives with no less force against the institutions, especially the hospitals which, in their mad desire to obtain money, have recourse to the most despicable and fraudulent methods. They falsified and forged indulgence-letters and Papal Bulls; they hired and sent out to collect in their name chaplains, who were not only dishonest but whose character too often was

²⁹ Mansi, XXIV., 828.

³⁰ Mansi, XXIV., 880.

³¹ Mansi, XXII., 901. Finke, *op. cit.* 45.

³² Mansi, XXIII., 32. Hartzheim, III., 531.

³³ Mansi, XXIII., 513. Finke, *op. cit.* 67.

³⁴ Mansi, XXIII., 693.

³⁵ Mansi, XXIII., 768.

³⁶ Urkundenbuch d. Stadt Strassburg I., No. 366.

³⁷ Mansi, XXIII., 857.

³⁸ Mansi, XXIII., 992.

³⁹ Mansi, XXIV., 141, 1077.

⁴⁰ Mansi, XXIV., 386.

a synonym for fraud.⁴¹ These reproaches and lamentations of Jacques de Vitry are by no means the product of conditions that prevailed during the period immediately preceding the so-called reformatory movement; they are the deliberate and irresistible expression by a historian and churchman of abuses as he witnessed them during the first quarter of the thirteenth century, and taking them at their face value, they are indicative of the astounding proportions the evil had assumed even at that early date.

To any one only moderately informed in the literature of the thirteenth century, the classic sermons of that great Franciscan preacher, Berthold of Ratisbon, are not altogether unfamiliar. The "sweet Brother Berthold," for so he was often called by the poets and chroniclers of his time, with the enthusiasm and fearlessness of a Savonarola, was unsparing in his denunciations of the "penny-preachers," as he was wont to call those wandering swindlers.⁴²

Albertus Magnus, in his commentary on *De muliere forti* (Prov. 31, 10-31) exclaims: "Alas, the times now are such, that with desire they [the people] listen to those preachers of evil, those 'quaestores' who for one penny lyingly exchange an indulgence of one hundred days, who prostitute the office of preaching for their own selfish purposes and for the sake of lucre preach not Christ, but fables and heresies. And they, too, preach everywhere who are utterly illiterate."⁴³

No less outspoken is the great canonist, St. Raymond of Pennafort, who, when speaking of these "quaestores," stigmatizes them as disseminators of false doctrines, habitues of banquets and slaves of drunkenness.⁴⁴

Dante, contrasting the preachers of old who faithfully followed the injunction of the Master with those of his time, thus characterizes these false preachers:

The preacher now provides himself with store
Of jests and gibes; and, so there be no lack
Of laughter, while he vents them, his big cowl
Distends, and he has won the meed he sought:
Could but the vulgar catch a glimpse the while
Of that dark bird which nestles in his hood,
They scarce would wait to hear the blessing said,

⁴¹ Jacobi de Vitrico libri duo Douay, (1597), 291, 339. Sermones (Antwerpen, 1575), 700. These two works I have not at hand. Cfr. Paulus, op. cit. XXXV., 527.

⁴² Goebel, Die Predigten d. Franziskaners Berthold V. Regensburg (Regensburg, 1906). Extracts from his sermons are given by Michael, op. cit. II., 116sq. Linsenmayer, Gesch. d. Predigt in Deutschland (München, 1886), 123sq. Cruel, Gesch. d. deut. Predigt im M-A (Detmold, 1879), 312sq. Paulus, op. cit. 525sq.

⁴³ The synod of Trier (1227) forbade preaching by sacerdotes illiterati et inexperti. Hartzheim, III., 530.

⁴⁴ Summa de poenitentia (Romae, 1603), 498. Cfr. Paulus, op. cit. 523.

Which now the dotards hold in such esteem,
That every counterfeit, who spreads abroad
The hands of holy promise, finds a throng
Of credulous fools beneath. Saint Anthony
Fattens with this his swine,⁴⁵ and others worse
Than swine, who diet at his lazy board,
Paying with unstampt metal⁴⁶ for their fare.⁴⁷

From what has been said it is needless to point out that over and above the scandals and mendacities, the unembarrassed hypocrisies and persistent impudence of these "quaestores," there was the havoc they created as disseminators of false doctrines. Many were illiterate, others were insufficiently grounded in the principles of orthodoxy. Then again, there were those who were out and out heretics, who thrust themselves into the office not so much for their own aggrandizement, but to use it as a means of propagating their heretical ideas. With us the Middle Ages are a synonym for the Ages of Faith, and, compared to the heresies of the twentieth, we are inclined to refer to those of the Middle Ages in terms of a negligible quantity; but in every age the Church has had and always will have its full measure of heresies, and the Middle Ages were not without their measure. It was mainly for this reason that synod after synod forbade preaching by the "quaestores." By a Bull of April 9, 1247 (*Ad nostram noveritis*), Innocent IV. directs the Dominicans of Freiburg to proceed against certain *quaestuarii* who are operating in the Diocese of Constance and who are disseminating erroneous doctrines relative to the Mother of Christ.⁴⁸ That similar efforts were made by other Popes during the thirteenth century, is a matter of history. But synodal and Papal decrees have no meaning for impostors, and should one be unfor-

⁴⁵ The poet refers here to the Hospital Brothers of St. Anthony. That these Brothers often gave occasion for just complaint on the part of the authorities is a matter of history. We may, however, question the justice of the everlasting scorn heaped upon them by the poet in singling them out to the exclusion of others who were no better and in some respects worse, than they. The Order of St. Anthony, by reason of its vocation more so perhaps than any other was firmly anchored in the popular esteem and sympathies of the thirteenth century. What was more natural than that many a swindler parading the country should don the habit of the order and operate in the name of St. Anthony in order the more easily to prey on the confidence of the people? As early as 1210 Innocent III. in a Bull (*Grave gerimus*) warned the people against just such impostors. In 1223 Honorius III. repeated verbatim the same warning. Similar warnings were issued in 1245 and 1252 by Innocent IV. and in 1297 and 1298 by Boniface VIII. Bulls were also issued for the protection of other orders against similar impositions, though on account of its popularity the evil concerned itself mostly with the Order of St. Anthony. (For references, see Paulus, op. cit. 531 sq.) At any rate, Dante singles out and stigmatizes this order to level a blow—though an indirect one—against his inveterate enemy, Boniface VIII., who in 1297 constituted the Brothers canons regular with the rule of St. Augustine.

⁴⁶ Unstampt metal, i. e., false indulgences.

⁴⁷ Paradiso (Cary's translation) Canto XXIX., 121-134.

⁴⁸ The Bull is published by Finke in "Die Freiburger Dominikaner und der Münsterbau (Freiburg, 1901) 46 sq.

tunate enough to be incarcerated or burned at the stake by the civil authorities, there were always others to take his place.

II.

Thus far we have laid the evil we are considering chiefly at the door of the "quaestores," the official almsgatherers. There we would prefer to leave it, did not our suspicions impel us, in the interest of truth, to carry our investigations for a moment into other camps. Of all the centuries of the Christian era, the thirteenth was the century of provincial and diocesan synods, at least so far as western Europe is concerned. They were the means adopted by the Fourth Lateran Council and insisted upon by the Popes to bring about a reform in the morals of the times, especially in those of the clergy. A cursory perusal of these synodal decrees leaves no doubt that if there was one point on which the synods as a whole concentrated their energies of reform, it was the check or complete eradication, if possible, of the abuses connected with indulgences. Yet, when we recall that in spite of the numerous restrictive and prohibitive measures the evil, so far from being checked, much less eradicated, rather assumed larger proportions, we cannot wholly divest ourselves of the suspicion that there were other forces at work, forces less patent perhaps, but none the less powerful and real.

Some years ago, an apparently unpretentious little work came to our desk in which is treated with considerable detail one phase of the antecedent history of the Second Council of Lyons (1274).⁴⁹ While not dealing professedly with the subject here under consideration, the author, nevertheless, gives a few hints that more than justify our suspicion. When Gregory X. had decided to convene the said Council, he sent letters to the heads of ecclesiastical provinces and religious orders requesting suggestions as to the reforms that ought to be undertaken by the Council and as to remedies best suited to give them effect. One of the parties thus appealed to was Humbertus de Romanis, the former General of the Dominicans. Speaking of the "quaestores" Humbert suggests that the Council adopt drastic measures against them for the following reasons: (1) by their systematic prevarication and immoral lives they bring disgrace and ridicule upon the Church; (2) *by bribing the prelates* they free themselves from all restraint, and thus are permitted to preach to the people whatever best suits their evil purposes; (3) many of the indulgences preached by them are fictitious, the work of their imagination; (4) of the large sums of money collected,

⁴⁹ Studien zu den Reformschriften f. d. zweite Lyoner Konzil. Joseph Auer (Freiburg, 1910).

they turn over only a small portion to the institutions in whose behalf the indulgences are granted. They deceive the people, moreover, with false relics.⁵⁰

Another work written about the same time and, as far as we can judge, for the same purpose as the above, is the *Collectio de scandalis ecclesiae*. It was published for the first time by Dr. Döllinger.⁵¹ Its authorship is a matter of uncertainty. Döllinger is inclined to attribute it to Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Canterbury, while more recent historians regard the author as a member of the Franciscan Order. At any rate, the work is all that its title implies and almost creates in us the impression that Bernard of Cluny had returned to life long enough to give vent anew to his bitter denunciations, choosing this time, however, a form less graceful and a Latinity less elegant. The principal faults of the prelates, says the author, are four: *defectus vitae, scientiae, doctrinae, diligentiae*. They are not *discipuli Christi sed Neronis*. They are incompetent to perform the duties of their office. They cannot preach nor hear confessions, and they aggravate this work for those who are competent by hiring "quaestores," who too often make use of such opportunities to deceive the people and to enrich themselves.

They (the prelates) are *amici luporum et inimici canum*. They are remarkable physicians; for every ailment they have the same prescription; every moral shortcoming, every sin is punished with the imposition of a pecuniary amercement. "I lie," says the author, "if the Bishops do not regularly grant to the 'quaestores' letters authorizing them to preach, letters sealed with their own seals, for which they (the Bishops) receive an exorbitant price."⁵²

In each of these documents we have a distinct, yet in significance substantially identical reference to the matter in hand. Not only do both anchor upon the almsgatherers a stigma of infamy with which we are familiar, but in the same breath they introduce us to forces and influences that made such infamy possible. They reveal a definite scheme of reciprocal action, a deliberate systematized plan of co-operation between *certain Bishops* and a certain class of almsgatherers to enrich themselves by means and methods the morality or immorality of which were their least concern. The Bishops were bribed. For a monetary consideration they would issue authenticated letters authorizing the recipient to preach and to collect alms in exchange for indulgences without inquiring into his character or the character of his wares. That under such protection the business

⁵⁰ Mansi, XXIV., 131.

⁵¹ Beiträge z. polit., kirchl. u. Culturgeschichte d. 6 letzten Jahrhunderte III. (Wien, 1882), 180-200. Auer, op. cit., 21-56.

⁵² Mentior, nisi quaestuariis passim conferant episcopi literas praedicandi sigillis propriis sigillatis, multum excessivo precio comparatas.

of the "quaestores" thrived, need hardly be said. The action of Popes and synods offered little hindrance to them so long as there were Bishops who were prepared to barter moral integrity for the *turpis quaestus* and flout every principle that was not dictated by greed.

It will perhaps be suggested that our characterizations of the *prelati* are extravagant and not warranted by the witnesses on whose utterances we seek to establish them. We are all familiar with the rule laid down for historian and reader alike, applicable indeed to all times, but to none more so than the Middle Ages, "the more pious the chronicler the blacker his colors." It is a rule that is too often disregarded by our separated brethren when they deal with what they are wont to call the "Dark Ages," with the result that facts are distorted and actions are misrepresented to the disadvantage of history. Who knows but what the complaints of the witnesses cited above are the expression of deeply sensitive and pious natures, inclined to look upon the times in which their lot was cast through highly colored and pessimistic spectacles? Then, too, anonymity should put us on our guard against taking statements at their face value until their reliability has been tested and their endorsement placed beyond question.

Be this as it may, fully developed and wide-spread abuses do not spring into existence over night. Their roots usually lie deeply buried somewhere in the past. That certain almsgatherers offered bribes and that certain Bishops should so far forget their character and calling as to accept them, ought not surprise us. Nor was it the only method to which recourse was had by them to force indulgences into the service of avarice. Against the excessive indulgences indiscreetly granted by certain Bishops, the Fathers of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) decreed that at the dedication of a church the indulgence granted shall not exceed one year, whether the ceremony be performed by one Bishop or more, and for the anniversary of the dedication or for any other cause, it shall not exceed forty days, this being the rule observed by the Pope himself on such occasions; yet, not so long after this rule was made we know it was violated, and it continued to be violated till the Council of Trent.

In his constitution, "Romana Ecclesia," of March 17, 1246, Innocent IV. takes occasion among other things to settle a long standing dispute between the Archbishop of Reims and his suffragans.⁵³ From a writing of Honorius III. we learn that as early as 1223 the Bishop of Laon had complained in Rome of the excessive demands made upon him by the Metropolitan of Reims. To enable him to

⁵³ For the following data relative to the abuse of indulgences by the Bishops, except where the references are given, I am indebted to N. Paulus, *Hist. Jahrb.* XXXV., 517-20, where the literature will be found.

carry on the construction of his cathedral, begun some twenty years earlier, the Archbishop with his chapter decided to take up a collection throughout the archdiocesan territory. He granted an indulgence of one year to all who should by pecuniary contributions assist in the work. Of the Bishop of Laon he demanded—a demand which we are quite safe in saying was extended also to the other suffragans—not only that he publish the indulgences throughout his diocese, but also that in every parish the clergy and people meet in public procession the “quaestores” sent out by Reims, and furthermore, that the day of their arrival be regarded as a holyday, with abstention from all work and attendance at divine services. What reply the Bishop of Laon received from Honorius III. is not known. The dispute, at any rate, continued till 1246, when Innocent IV. decided that the Archbishop is under no condition justified to authorize his “quaestores” to insist that the subjects of the suffragan Bishops meet them in public procession and that the day of their arrival be declared a holyday. At most he may appeal to them through their Bishops to extend to them a friendly and cordial reception. The Pope also reminded him that in granting an indulgence of one year he had overstepped the limit of forty days decreed by the Fourth Lateran Council.

At first sight these demands of the Archbishop appear innocent enough when contrasted with other methods then in vogue. A little reflection, however, cannot help but force upon us the suspicion that notwithstanding harmless appearances, there is behind and beneath those demands a well-defined plan of action and that the method is not without its measure of madness. That the suffragan Bishops with their clergy and people were uncompromisingly opposed to such demands is well known. Hence, recourse must be had to means that will successfully break such opposition and force compliance with the wishes of Reims. What the Archbishop really wished to introduce and enforce throughout his metropolitan district was that his “quaestores” should threaten and if need be visit with ecclesiastical censures such persons and such localities as refused to comply with his demands. Nor must he be regarded the originator of this scheme. What the Archbishop of Reims tried to do had already been often done by other Bishops in their dioceses. When in 1237 Bishop Hermann of Würzburg decided to take up a collection in his diocese for the construction of his cathedral, he directed his clergy to warn the faithful that they must attend the sermons of the “quaestores” sent out by him and avail themselves of the indulgences granted by contributing to the collection or incur the penalty of excommunication. Though not expressed in so many words, the same alternative is implied in an indulgence-letter published in 1240 by the Bishop of

Metz in the interest of his cathedral and addressed to all the faithful of the diocese. In it we read that in every parish the clergy and people, preceded by the cross-bearer, censer and holy water, are to meet in solemn procession the relics which the "quaestores" from Metz bring with them, and this procession is to be repeated on the day of their departure. Moreover, all work shall be suspended as on Sunday till the "quaestores" have finished their business.⁵⁴ Instructions similar in content, embodying the same alternative of submission to unreasonable and unjust demands or the incurring of excommunication, were issued in 1243 by Konrad of Hostaden, Archbishop of Cologne, to his clergy in the interest of the Church of St. Mary in Trier; in 1267 by Archbishop Johann of Prague for his cathedral; in 1278 by Bishop Bertold of Würzburg in favor of the Knights of St. John of Mergentheim;⁵⁵ in 1290 by Bishop Konrad of Verden in favor of the Brothers of St. Anthony; in 1299 by Bishop Otto of Paderborn; by Bishop Heinrich of Breslau (1301-19); by Archbishop Matthias of Mainz for the Brothers of St. Anthony in 1322. Walsingham has left us a record of his disgust with the conduct of a certain Cardinal who sojourned in England to negotiate a marriage between Richard II. and the daughter of emperor, Charles IV. Adopting the methods of the "quaestores," this prelate, for a pecuniary consideration, absolved from excommunication; he dispensed from pilgrimages to the Holy Land, to the tombs of the Apostles, demanding, however, as the price of his dispensations the money that would have been spent on a journey to those places.⁵⁶ That the Papal Legate, Bartholomaeus de Camerino, during his sojourn in Sweden (1484-85) sold indulgences was pointed out some years ago by J. Collijn in his publication of a hitherto unknown indulgence-letter.⁵⁷

Instances as these leave no doubt that the efforts of the synods to remedy the evil were but too often counteracted by the bad example from high quarters, an example, however, so far as the thirteenth century is concerned, that must not be exaggerated or over-estimated. For while it is true that not a few of the prelates had

⁵⁴ In adventu autem reliquiarum . . . pariterque recessu, per singula loca ad que devenerint, pulsatis campanis, convocato clero et omni populo, cum cruce et thuribulo et aqua benedicta precedente, cum omni sollemnitate debita processionaliter eis occurratis, et dies illa ab opere servili, sicut dies dominica, ab omnibus celebris et festiva habeatur, quousque predictum negotium plenius fuerit adimpletum.

⁵⁵ Mandamus, quatenus omnes parrochiales vestros annos discretionis habentes diligenter moneatis et sub poena excommunicationis ipsis precipiatis . . . ut ad ecclesias vestras omnes sine mora convenient ad diem, horam et locum quem vobis lator presentium duxerit assignandum, nuntios fratrum domus hospitalis Ierosolimitani in Mergentheim super suo negotio audituri. Item precipimus, ut . . . ab omni opere servili . . . vacare studeant universi, donec missa fuerit celebrata.

⁵⁶ "Historia Anglicana," Rolls Series, I., 452.

⁵⁷ Kyrhohistorisk Arsskrift, (1902), 123-29.

identified themselves with the promoters of an abuse that had been anathematized over and over again, their number was comparatively small in proportion to those who sought to remedy it by individual and concerted action. Moreover, if the almsgatherers could attribute the invention of not a few of their devices to swindle the people to the ingenuity of certain prelates, these latter in turn could believe themselves all the more justified in adopting the methods referred to because they had often been used by the Popes. The financial difficulties from which the Popes suffered in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, though by no means comparable to the same difficulties which they experienced during their sojourn on French soil, constituted a long and in some respects an unpleasant chapter in the history of the Papacy. The long and bitter conflict between the Papacy, and the empire which began in the eleventh century, reached its climax in the thirteenth and terminated in the fall of the Hohenstaufens, was not without its disastrous effects upon the Papal treasury. By no means subordinated to the struggle at home was the anxiety of the Popes to liberate Jerusalem and the holy places from the control of the Mohammedans. It was the age of the crusades. But the preaching of the crusade in the thirteenth century met with considerable opposition. The movement was no longer the enthusiastic *Deus lo volt* of 1095. The temporal princes, besides being loath to lose their jurisdiction of those of their subjects who took part in the crusades, were too much absorbed in their own petty territorial disputes to risk the dispatch of their military forces to a distant land. The enthusiasm of the people, too, had waned. It is true, the old traditions that had inspired and made possible the crusades still lingered in the breasts of many, but times had changed. The altered conditions of civilized life had contributed powerfully to the general well-being and prosperity of all classes of society in western Europe, and the consequent habits of luxury and pleasure-seeking were ill adapted to keep alive an ardor and an earnestness in the affairs of the Orient. It was under such circumstances that some Popes authorized the crusade preachers, at least certain ones, to proclaim holydays in the parishes which they visited and to force the faithful, if need be with ecclesiastical censures, to attend their sermons. Whatever might have been the justification for such extreme coercive measures in the minds of those who authorized them, history has not failed to record the deep dissatisfaction and antagonistic feeling that they created in the clergy and laity. They complained of the large number of holydays (*multitudinem festorum*), of the unyielding dictatorial policy and arrogant pretensions of the preachers, of unwarranted interference in parochial affairs, and above all, there was their unconcealed disgust for a

method which from the religious viewpoint lacked every redeeming feature. To aggravate the evil, not unfrequently ordinary "quaestores" adopted this method. Not only would they demand of the pastor free lodging and a generous hospitality, but by their own authority they sought to compel the people to attend their sermons under penalty of excommunication.⁵⁸

Ecclesiastical authorities continued to combat the evil. The first quarter of the fourteenth century witnessed a long array of provincial and diocesan synods which occupied themselves with the doings of the "quaestores."⁵⁹ In the main their methods of procedure against them was but a repetition of those of earlier synods. In 1301 the synod of Mainz, for many and good reasons (*propter multas rationabiles causas*), recalled the letters of authorization that had been issued to the almsgatherers to have them carefully examined by the metropolitan court before their issuance would be renewed.⁶⁰ About the same time the synod of Cambrai ruled that the collection was to be taken up by the local pastors and not by the "quaestores," emphasizing the fact, however, that the pastors are not to retain a certain percentage of the collection.⁶¹ A synod of Cologne in 1300 required the pastors to give the faithful frequent warning regarding these wandering preachers and to have those arrested who could not produce genuine credentials.⁶² The convocation of the Council of Vienne (1311-12) had for one of its purposes the reformation of morals. Speaking of the "quaestores" the Council gives a list of abuses to which they resorted to deceive the simple people in order to obtain their money, to the great detriment of souls and to the scandal of many.⁶³ "By their own authority do they grant indulgences to the people; they dispense from vows, absolve those who confess to them from perjury, murder and other sins; they absolve penitents from the restitution of ill-gotten goods, remit a third or fourth part of the sacramental penance; for money they will liberate from purgatory three or more souls of the donor's friends or relatives and lead them into the joys of paradise; the benefactors of those institutions in whose interests they profess to be working they grant a plenary indulgence, and there are not wanting those who go so far as to make the indulgence an instrument of absolution from punishment and from guilt (*a poena et a*

⁵⁸ Hist. Jahrb. XXXV., 521 sq.

⁵⁹ Op. cit., 530-36.

⁶⁰ Hartzheim, IV., 96.

⁶¹ Martene, Collectio amplissima VII., 1331.

⁶² Hartzheim, IV., 41.

⁶³ Clem. c. 2. de poen. et rem. V., 9).

culpa)."⁶⁴ After recommending that the almsgatherers be deprived of all those privileges that are likely to lead to abuse, the Council insists that the Bishops proceed vigorously against those who continue to transgress conciliar and synodal statutes.⁶⁵

A provincial synod of Dublin in 1348 strictly forbade the recognition of "quaestores" who could not present genuine and properly authenticated letters. Pastors who knowingly violated this statute *ipso facto* incurred suspension for one year and the "quaestores" themselves incurred excommunication. If the latter persisted during forty days to disregard the prohibition, they were to be arrested and incarcerated till their case had been disposed of by the Ordinary of the diocese.⁶⁶

In 1303 Bishop Friedrich of Strassburg warned his clergy against swindlers (*falsarii*), who, under the protection of forged letters of authorization, operated in his diocese in the interests of the cathedral of Strassburg.⁶⁷ Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1378 found himself similarly compelled to take action against "quaestores" who went about the diocese provided with false credentials, exchanging for money false indulgences and preaching erroneous doctrines.⁶⁸ The University of Oxford, giving its opinion of the almsgatherers in 1414, did not exaggerate when it declared: "The shameless "quaestores" acquire *turpissimos suos quaestus ad firman* with Simon Magus, they sell indulgences with Gyges and they squander the money thus obtained with the prodigal son; still more detestable is the fact that not being constituted in sacred orders, they preach publicly, pretend that they possess the power to absolve *a poena et a culpa* both the living and the dead; they promise the

⁶⁴ It was a common practice during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in granting plenary and at times too partial indulgences to designate them in the indulgences-formulae and indulgence-letters simply as a remission of sin, understanding thereby a remissio peccatorum quoad poenam but not quoad culpam. In this sense and in no other has the expression always been understood in the Church. It was only when the term fell into the hands of illiterate and perverted preachers that it was misunderstood and then at times deliberately so to serve the purposes of greed. It may be added that the expression is used in our own day. Pius X. in his Encyclical Magni faustique of March 8, 1913, announcing the Universal Jubilee Indulgence to commemorate the liberty guaranteed to the Church by Constantine the Great, granted a plenary indulgence of all sins (plenissimam omnium peccatorum Indulgentiam ad instar Jubilaei generalis concedimus. (See Am. Eccl. Review, XLVIII., 592.) On this subject cfr. N. Paulus in Zeitschr. f. Kath. Theologie XXXVI., (1912), 67-96, 252-279, and in Hist.-polit. Blätter CLXVII. (1921), 17-25, 81-93.

⁶⁵ The Acts of this council have been lost, with the exception of a fragment which was discovered by Father Ehrle, S. J., in the Bibliotheque Nationale at Paris and published by him in Archive f. Literatur u. Kirchengesch. des M.-A. IV., 361-470. The council closed with the third formal session. Whether it enacted a decree in reference to the "quaestores" is not known; at any rate, it is doubtful. On the manner in which this decree with a number of others found their way into the Clementines, "Corpus Juris Canonici," cfr. Ehrle op. cit., IV., 439-70.

⁶⁶ Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae (1737), II., 750.

⁶⁷ Urkundenbuch d. Stadt Strassburg II., No. 242.

⁶⁸ Wilkins, op. cit., III., 131.

people the remission of future sins, by a variety of blasphemies rob and mislead them, and draw them to hell with them. The abuses of such pestiferous sects should be removed from the Church."⁶⁹

No less energetic than the Bishops and synods were the Popes in combatting the dishonest indulgence-preachers and almsgatherers. Again and again John XXII. proceeded against them in more ways than one. When he learned that the Brothers of a certain religious order were abusing their credentials as almsgatherers, he had all who found themselves in France arrested on the same day, November 1, 1330. In the same year he himself excommunicated certain swindling collectors who posed as members of the Hospital Brothers of St. Anthony. When in 1326 he was informed that dishonest "quaestores" were operating in Norway and Sweden, he dispatched to those countries two Nuncios with instructions to eradicate the evil with the aid of the Scandinavian Bishops.⁷⁰

In 1369 Urban V. issued his Bull *Nuper dilectis* against the Hospitaler Brothers of St. John of Jerusalem in England, who, he had heard, *in pluribus contra juris et rationis metas impudenter excedunt*. They claim to have received certain privileges which dispensed them from exhibiting letters of authorization and hence were not bound to exhibit any in order to be allowed to preach and to make known their mission to the people. Moreover, says the Pope, very often these "quaestores," when they set about to injure a pastor, go to his church on some feast-day, especially at a time when the faithful are wont to come and make their offerings. Then they begin to make their collections or to announce the name of their organization, and continue until such an hour as to make the convenient celebration of Mass on that day impossible. Thus they deprive the pastors of the offerings which accrue to them at such Masses. They hold, moreover, divine services in interdicted or polluted places and there, too, bury the dead.⁷¹

Boniface IX. in a Bull issued against the "quaestores" in 1390, speaks of certain religious of different mendicant orders and of some *clerici saeculares etiam in dignitatibus constituti* who roam through the country claiming that they have been sent out by us or by the Legates or Nuncios of the Apostolic See to collect money for us and for the Roman Church. They abuse their genuine credentials and invent false ones. For a small sum of money they throw the veil of a lying absolution over hardened sinners who have no thought of abandoning their iniquity, absolving, to use their own words, from the most atrocious crimes without any contrition on

⁶⁹ Wilkins, III., 365.

⁷⁰ Hist. Jahrb. XXXV., 536.

⁷¹ Wilkins, III., 84.

the part of the penitent nor the fulfillment of any of the prescribed forms. They absolve from the vows of chastity, or abstinence, of pilgrimage to the tombs of the Apostles. For money they receive heretics into the Church without requiring a formal abjuration of their errors; they allow illegitimate children to receive orders and to be promoted to benefices; they dispense from impediments within prohibited degrees, take off excommunication, interdict and other censures; they proclaim that they are collecting this money in the name of the apostolic chamber, and yet they never give an account of it to any one. The Pope commands the Bishops to inquire into the doings of these religious and secular priests, their accomplices and associations, make them render an account, confiscate their receipts and imprison them *de plano, ac sine strepitu et figura judicii*.⁷²

Enough has been said to give the reader an idea of the agencies, the circumstances and nature of the abuses associated with indulgences. The same abuses and the same complaints known and heard from the end of the twelfth century continued uninterruptedly into the sixteenth. The Council of Trent in its fifth session, June 17, 1546 (De reform. c. 2) contented itself with merely prohibiting the "quaestores" to preach; in its twenty-first session, however, July 16, 1562 (De reform. c. 9) it once for all laid the axe to the root of the evil by abolishing the office of "quaestor," thus removing an institution which from its inception had been but too often a curse and a scandal. From what has been said, it is apparent, too, that during those centuries of abuse there was no lack of sincere effort, individual and concerted, to put an end to the evil. If that effort proved ineffective, the failure must be attributed not to any one cause, but rather to a series or combination of causes. In the first place, had the Bishops and clergy co-operated and formed a solid and unflinching phalanx against that army of evil-doers, or had the Bishops alone taken a determined stand and thrown the weight of their united power against the many-headed monster, history would have been spared the disagreeable task of recording actions and situations whose only redeeming feature seems to be that they furnish a subsidiary argument in favor of the Church's divinity. But selfish interests prevailed. As we have seen, the collections taken up by almsgatherers in exchange for indulgences, it mattered not whether their methods were honest or dishonest, not unfrequently constituted a source of revenue for the Bishops and pastors in whose districts the money was collected. It is true, the Popes had on more than one occasion prohibited the retention by Bishops and pastors of a certain percentage of such collections, in practice, how-

⁷² Raynaldus ad an., 1390, N. 2.

ever, the prohibition remained a dead letter. Bishops, too, had forbidden their clergy to lay a tax upon the almsgatherers, yet in practice, too often, these very Bishops showed an utter disregard for the Papal injunction.

Another cause of failure was the multiplicity of indulgences granted for alms. When we recall that there was scarcely any useful purpose for which they were not granted, it does not require a long stretch of the imagination to picture to ourselves a country overrun by preachers, beggars and peddlers whose one aim was to get rid of their wares at any cost, and if people did not always have pieces of money, to use the language of Chaucer's pardoner, "silver spones, broches, or rynges" were always acceptable. To restrict the number of collections, the Popes from the time of Gregory IX. in issuing indulgence-letters frequently inserted a clause which forbade the letter to be handed over to or used by the "quaestores" as a means of collecting money, and to insure against its violation they made its observance a condition of the validity of the indulgence. This method was often adopted by the Bishops, and while it contributed not a little towards the reduction of the number of such collections, the frequency, nevertheless, with which such letters were granted to churches, institutions and religious associations with expressed permission to be used by "quaestores," was not likely to bring about a noticeably corresponding check of the abuse.

A third factor, and one that contributed perhaps more than any other to the failure of reform measures, was the appointment to the office of "quaestor" or men whose character and habits were at variance with the honest and upright execution of the task with which they were entrusted. It goes without saying, had always men of irreproachable character been appointed to the office of "quaestor," or had those been ejected from the office who proved themselves dishonest or unfit, the evil would have been, if not completely eradicated, at least reduced to a negligible extent. The interest, however, which ecclesiastical authorities too often had in such collections conflicted with such a course, and when all is said, view the question from whatever angle we will, while a large amount of blame must be charged up to the "quaestores," not a small measure of responsibility for the evil must be laid upon the shoulders of the authorities.

The desire for money and for power is as old as the human heart, and given the opportunity, unless checked by motives and principles stronger and nobler than those that are its inspiration, it will manifest itself, and regardless of the honesty or dishonesty of methods, seek to attain its end. If Bishops and clergy abused indulgences, their number was small when compared to the number of those who

stood firm against that abuse. If almsgatherers took advantage of a discredited method, the number of those who shunned it was far in excess. And as for impostors, we have them in our own day and in our own country, many of them, and their business often is a thriving one in spite of the boasted efficiency of our police forces. For a few pieces of silver the Son of God was betrayed into the hands of His executioners. But that fact constitutes no reflection on His character, nor has it ever been used even by His worst enemies to discredit His mission. There is no institution, however holy, that has entirely escaped the malice of men. As long as men are human there will be abuses. And while the abuse of indulgences during the later Middle Ages was undeniably great—at times intolerable—the Church, so far from encouraging the traffic, never ceased to combat the evil through her Popes, Bishops and synods.

Somerset, Ohio.

H. J. SCHROEDER, O. P.

COMETS AS PORTENTS.

EVERY time a comet is scheduled to appear in the heavens, the newspapers devote column after column to the discussion of popular fears and superstitions concerning the possible effect of the heavenly wanderer upon our own planet. The approach of Reid's Comet during the month of May and of Winnecke's Comet during the month of June proved to be no exception to the rule, but as Sir John Herschel once remarked:

No one, hitherto, has been able to assign any single point in which we should be a bit better or worse off, materially speaking, if there were no such thing as a comet. Persons, even thinking persons, have busied themselves with conjectures; such as that they may serve for fuel for the sun (into which, however, they never fall), or that they may cause warm summers, which is a mere fancy, or that they may give rise to epidemics, or potato-blight, and so forth.

And though, as he justly says, "this is all wild talking," yet it will probably continue until astronomers have been able to master the problems respecting comets which hitherto have in great measure foiled their best efforts.

From time immemorial deep-seated in the minds of all mortals in all ages has been the idea that comets should be feared as stars of ill-omen; that they never appear but as

the threatening eyes of divine vengeance or the flashing tongue of an enraged deity, to portend with dread surety death, plague, famine, earthquake or terrific storms; and that although there may have been a few exceptions when they have seemed favorable to some one, yet these same comets have been equally inauspicious and unlucky for another.

Ancient writers always depicted them under the most terrifying and mysterious images. They were javelins, sabres, swords of fire, horses' manes, dragons' mouths, bleeding crosses, flaming daggers or decapitated heads with hair and bristling beard. They shone with the red light of blood, yellow or livid, like that of which the historian Josephus speaks, which showed itself during the terrible siege of Jerusalem. Pliny found in this same comet "a whiteness so brilliant that one could hardly look at it; men saw there the image of God under a human form."

Aristotle, the founder of the Peripatetic School, states¹ that the fact that comets are composed of fire is a reason why many of them are signs of windstorms and droughts. And Seneca likewise thinks

1 "Meteorologica," Bk. I., ch. 7.

that comets are natural signs as well as causes of storms, although he thinks they are stars; for he says:²

Aristotle says that comets are signs of bad weather and wind and rain storms. Why then do you not consider it a star, even though it does announce the future? For this is not a sign of bad weather in the same manner as

"That oil doth shine and soft mushrooms grow hard"

is of future rain, or as it is a sign that the sea will become angry if

"The sea coots sport on land, the heron quits

Its accustomed marsh, and o'er the high cloud flits"—

but as the equinox is of a year turning hot and cold, as those reasons which the Chaldean astrologers give why a star determines something sad or joyful for men at their birth.

In old times, when the appearance and movements of comets were supposed to be altogether uncontrolled by physical laws, it was natural that comets should be regarded as signs from heaven, tokens of Divine Providence in favor of others. As Seneca sagely remarked:

There is no man so dull, so obtuse, so turned to earthly things, who does not direct all the powers of his mind toward things divine when some novel phenomenon appears in the heavens. While all follows its usual course up yonder, familiarity robs the spectacle of its grandeur. For so is man made. However wonderful may be what he sees day after day, he looks on it with indifference; while matters of very little importance attract and interest him if they depart from the accustomed order. The host of heavenly constellations beneath the vault of heaven, whose beauty they adorn, attract no attention; but if any unusual appearance be noticed among them, at once all eyes are turned heavenwards. The sun is only looked on with interest when he is undergoing an eclipse. Men observe the moon only under like conditions. . . . So thoroughly is it a part of our nature to admire the new rather than the great. The same is true of comets. When one of these fiery bodies of unusual form appears, every one is eager to know what it means; men forget other objects to inquire about the new arrival; they know not whether to wonder or tremble; for many spread fear on all sides, drawing from the phenomenon most grave prognostics.

Although there is no direct reference to comets in the Bible, either in the Old Testament or the New, yet it is quite possible that some of the signs from heaven recorded in the Bible were such. As, for instance, in Genesis³, after God had promised seed to Abraham, "and when the sun was set, there arose a dark mist, and there appeared a smoking furnace and a lamp of fire passing between those divisions."

² "Natural Questions," Bk. VII., ch. 28.

³ Ch. xv., 17.

According to some writers, both of theology and matters scientific, the star which guided the Wise Men from the East may have been a comet, since the word used signifies any bright object in the heavens. Such is the opinion of St. John Damascene, as expressed in his article on comets,⁴ where he claims

Comets often rise up overhead, portending the death of kings; but these are not among the number of those stars which were produced in the creation of things, but after that very time are enkindled and afterwards caused to disappear. Because not even that star which appeared to the Magi at the time when the Lord for our sake in His mercy towards men and for their salvation was born in the flesh, was one of those stars which were created in the beginning of the world. And this is made clear by the fact that it advanced now from the East to the West, and now from the North to the South; now disappeared, now again appeared; which indeed is different from the order and nature of stars.

And it is to this same "heavenly intruder" that the Sibylline Oracle referred when she prophesied the fall of Rome and the birth of the promised Messiah:

The stars shall all fall forward in the sea,
All one by one, yet shall men see in heaven
A brilliant comet, sign of much distress
About to come, of war and battle-strife.⁵

Three hundred and seventy-one years before the Christian era, a comet appeared which Aristotle (who was a boy at the time) has recorded. In the day-book of Diodorus Siculus it is so entered:

In the first year of the 102d Olympiad, Alcisthenes being Archon of Athens, several prodigies announced the approaching humiliation of the Lacedæmonians; a blazing torch of extraordinary size, which was compared to a flaming beam, was seen during several nights.

The comet was regarded by Ephorus as having not merely presaged but produced the earthquakes which caused the towns of Helice and Bura to be submerged. This was clearly in the mind of Seneca when he said that as soon as it appeared it brought about the submergence of these two towns.

In those times, however, comets were not regarded solely as signs of disaster. As the misfortunes of one nation were commonly held to be of advantage to other nations, so the same comet might be regarded very differently by different peoples or different rulers. Thus the comet of the year 344 B. C. was regarded by Timoleon of Corinth as presaging the success of his expedition against the Sicilians. "The gods announced," says Diodorus Siculus, "by a remarkable portent, his success and future greatness; a blazing torch ap-

⁴ "Orthodox Faith," Bk. II., ch. 7.

⁵ Bk. VIII., lines 190-193.

peared in the heavens at night, and went before the fleet of Timoleon until he arrived in Sicily." And Plutarch expresses the same opinion in his life of Timoleon:

And now, with seven Corinthian ships, and two from Corcyra, and ten which the Leucadians furnished, he set sail. And at night after he had entered the open sea and was enjoying a favoring wind, the heavens seemed to burst open on a sudden above his ship, and to pour forth an abundant and conspicuous fire. From this a torch lifted itself on high, like those which the mystics bear, and running along with them on their course, darted down upon precisely that part of Italy towards which the pilots were steering. . . . Such, then, were the signs from heaven which encourage the expedition.

In like manner, the comets of the years 133 and 118 B. C. were not regarded as portents of death, but as signalizing, the former the birth, the latter, the accession, of Mithridates.

Usually, however, it must be admitted that the ancients, like the men of the Middle Ages, regarded comets as harbingers of evil. According to Pliny,⁶

A comet is generally regarded as a terrible star and one not easily expiated; as was the case with the civil commotions in the consulship of Octavius and also in the war of Pompey and Cæsar. And in our own age, about the time when Claudius was poisoned and left the Empire to Domitian, and afterwards, while the latter was Emperor, there was one which was almost constantly seen and was very frightful.

Cicero⁷ also mentions the second event when he argues that a proof of the existence of a divine power is the fact that terror is produced in the minds of men "by meteors in the air, and blazing stars, by the Greeks called kometes, by us *crinitae*, the appearance of which in the late Octavian war were foreboders of great calamities." Pliny calls the comet fixed because it shone for six months, and terrible because of the effects of Nero's cruelty. He goes on to say:

It is important to notice towards what part it darts its beams, or from what star it receives its influence, what it resembles, and in what place it shines. If it resembles a flute, it portends something unfavorable to music; something respecting wit and learning, if it forms a triangular or quadrangular figure with the position of some of the fixed stars; and that some one will be poisoned if they appear in the head of either the northern or southern serpent.

And yet with Pliny, the Romans appear to have seriously believed that the great comet which appeared at the death of Cæsar in the

⁶ "Natural History," Bk. II., ch. 25.

⁷ "On the Nature of the Gods," Bk. II., ch. 3.

year 43 B. C. was really the spirit of the Dictator. It is by this metamorphosis that Ovid concludes his great work⁸ dedicated to Augustus himself. Venus descends from the ethereal vaults and

invisible to all eyes stops in the midst of the senate. From the body of Cæsar she takes his spirit, prevents it from evaporating and bears it to the region of the stars. In rising, the goddess feels it transformed into a divine and glowing substance. She allows it to escape from her bosom. The spirit flies away beyond the moon and becomes a brilliant star, which draws through a long space its ignited hair.

But I return to Nero, who for the very reason that he himself feared forced others to fear. This we have on the authority of Tacitus.⁹ "During these things," referring to certain prodigies seen in the fourth consulship of Nero, "there appeared a blazing starre, which in the opinion of the common people betokeneth the change of a Prince. Therefore, as though Nero had already been driven out, they were busie to know who should succeed him." But since many appeared during his reign, that he might avert destruction from himself, he was accustomed to expiate them with the blood of illustrious men, having been instructed to do so by Babilus the Astrologer, as Suetonius¹⁰ relates in his life of Nero:

With no lesse cruelty raged hee abroad even against strangers and meere forainers. A blazing hairy starre, commonly thought to portend death and destruction to the highest pourses, began to arise, and had appeared many nights together. Beeing troubled therewith, and enformed by Babilus the Astrologer, that Kings were wont to expiate such prodigious signes with some notable massacre, and so divert the same from themselves, and turne it upon the heads of their Peeres and Nobles, hee thereupon projected the death of all the Noblest personages in the Citie.

This is confirmed by Tacitus,¹¹ who tells us:

In the end of the yeere prodigious wonders were noysed as messengers of imminent misfortunes. Great and often flashes of lightnings and a blazing star always purged by Nero with the blood of noble men.

Suetonius agrees with Tacitus in attributing this fear to the common opinion of the deity, as is evident from the above quotation; but even more absolutely in his life of Claudius¹²:

Especial tokens there were presaging and prognosticating his death: to wit, the rising of an hairy (or blazing) starre which they call a Comet.

⁸ "Metamorphoses," Bk. XV., lines 843-850.

⁹ Annals, Bk. XIV., ch. 22.

¹⁰ "Lives of the Cæsars," Bk. VI., ch. 36.

¹¹ Annals, Bk. XV., ch. 47.

¹² "Lives of the Cæsars," Bk. V., ch. 46.

Even Christian writers saw in the comet a divine message. For instance, Tertullian¹³ writes:

And as to the fires which lately hung all night over the walls of Carthage, they who saw them know what they threatened. . . . All these things are signs of God's impending wrath, which we must needs publish and proclaim in every possible way; and in the meanwhile we must pray it may be only local. Sure are they to experience it one day in its universal form, who interest otherwise these examples.

Poetry has ever been the faithful repository of popular opinion and prejudice. It is therefore fruitful in references about the comet superstition. It is very probable that Homer does not refer anywhere directly to comets, as a modern astronomer has intimated. Strangely enough, Pingre and Lalande, the former noted for his researches into ancient comets, the latter a skillful astronomer, agree in considering that Homer really referred to a comet in a certain passage, and they even regard it as an apparition of the comet of 1680. There is a Greek proverb to the effect that "there is no comet which does not bear evil in its train" and this sentiment is echoed by Claudian,¹⁴ when he avers that comets are

Unless some fell calamity be nigh.
ne'er observed by mortal eye,

Vergil, that "wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded by the hand of man," in enumerating the portents which were seen in the fierce civil war at Philippi, bursts forth in this strain:

Such peals of thunder never poured from high,
Nor forked lightnings flashed from such a sullen sky.
Red meteors ran across the ethereal space;
Stars disappeared, and comets took their place.
For this, the Aemathian plains once more were strewed
With Roman bodies, and just heaven thought good
To fatten twice those fields with Roman blood.¹⁵

And Lucan, about those same signs before the civil war, says:

The darkest nights on unknown stars did gaze
And saw the sky aflame, the torches' glare
In all directions flying through the air,
A fear-inspiring star's dread hairy train—
A comet threatening the tyrant's reign.¹⁶

Not otherwise is Silius Italicus, the epic narrator of the Punic Wars:

So blazing comets, with ensanguined hair,
Shoot sparkles round, that kindle half the sphere,

¹³ "To Scapula," ch. 3.

¹⁴ "Getic War," line 243.

¹⁵ "Georgics," Bk. I., lines 487-492.

¹⁶ "Pharsalia," Bk. I., lines 526-529.

Then o'er the heavens direct their rapid flight,
Make nature change, and throw pernicious light.¹⁷

And again:

And comets, that portend the fall of kings,
Shot flashing sparkles from their sanguine wings.¹⁸

Papinius Statius also mentions the baneful consequences of the dreaded comet,¹⁹ as does Vergil again in his larger and more important work:

Thus threatening comets, when by night they rise,
Shoot sanguine streams, and sadden all the skies;
So Sirius, flashing forth sinister lights,
Pale human kind with plagues and with dry famine frights.²⁰

In his famous satire on woman, Juvenal speaks with bitter sarcasm of feminine curiosity when he says: "She is the first to see the comet that menaces the Armenian and Parthian king." He evidently refers to the expedition made by the Emperor Trajan in 106, or to the earthquake in the neighborhood of Antioch in 115, "when mountains subsided and rivers burst forth," as Dio Cassius relates. Both of these events were supposed to have been influenced by "dire portentous stars." The Erythrean Sibyl in prophesying the woes to come on Lybia says²¹ that

In the west there shall a star shine forth
Which they will call a comet, sign to men
Of the sword and of famine and of death,
And murder of great leaders and chief men.

Tibullus calls comets "the evil signs of war,"²² and Valerius Flaccus sings that they are

called down
By angry Jove upon the tyrant crown.²³

Pontanus likewise, in his work on meteors, insists that comets give sure signs about the winds, even portend war and destruction of great people and deaths of Kings; so that when they show their threatening heads in the sky, cities are filled with terror, neighbors advance in war and brothers fight against brothers.

Among the poets even of our own time do we find allusions made to the evil brought by these flashing mysteries. Sylvester has well rendered in English a well-known passage from Du Bartas thus:

Canst thou tearless gaze
(Even by night) on that prodigious blaze,

¹⁷ "Punics," Bk. I., lines 461-464.

¹⁸ "Punics," Bk. VIII., lines 636-637.

¹⁹ "Thebaid," Bk. I., line 708.

²⁰ "Aeneid," Bk. X., lines 272-275.

²¹ Bk. III., lines 273-275.

²² "Elegies," Bk. II., No. 5, lines 71-72.

²³ "Argonauticon," Bk. VI., lines 607-608.

That hairy Comet, that long streaming Star,
Which threatens Earth with Famine, Plague and War?²⁴

The bard of Avon several times mentions them as stars of ill-omen. In the first act of "Hamlet"²⁵ Horatio says:

In the most high and palmy state of Rome,
A little ere the mightiest Julius fell,
The graves stood tenantless, and the sheeted dead
Did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets:
As stars with trains of fire and dews of blood,
Disasters in the sun.

And Henry VI. laments the death of Henry V. in this wise:

Comets, importing change of times and states,
Brandish your crystal tresses in the sky,
And with them scourge the bad revolting stars
That have consented unto Henry's death!²⁶

The words of Calpurnia in "Julius Cæsar,"

When beggars die there are no comets seen;
The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes,²⁷

have been quoted so often that they have become proverbial. Crashaw in his "Steps to the Temple"²⁸ compares Herod's angry countenance to

the fatal light
Of starring comets, that look kingdoms dead.

It is the poet Thomson, however, who goes a step farther and mentions several known facts about these "forget-me-nots" of the heavens besides the fear which they are said to produce. In his beautiful description of summer occurs this vivid passage:

Lo! from the dread immensity of space
Returning, with accelerated course,
The rushing comet to the sun descends;
And as he sinks below the shading earth,
With awful train projected o'er the heavens,
The guilty nations tremble.

And Young, after him, in his "Night Thoughts,"²⁹ likens the fickleness of fortune to these mysterious bodies in those expressive lines:

Oh, how portentous in prosperity!
How comet-like, it threatens while it shines.

But probably the most quoted lines on this subject in English verse are from Milton's "Paradise Lost,"³⁰ wherein he describes the

²⁴ "Weeks," I., 2.

²⁵ Scene 1, lines 113-118.

²⁶ "Henry VI.," 1, act i., scene 1, lines 2-5.

²⁷ Act ii., scene 2. line 30.

²⁸ "Sospetto d'Herod," Bk. I., stanza 7, lines 3-4.

²⁹ Night V., lines 915-916.

³⁰ Bk. II., lines 706-711.

voyage of Satan to the Gates of Hell. First comes the description of the guardian of the gates, and then he goes on to say:

On th' other side,
Incensed with indignation, Satan stood
Unterrified, and like a comet burned,
That fires the length of Opiuchus huge
In th' artick sky, and from his horrid hair
Shakes pestilence and war.

But, to go back to the historians, Josephus, commenting on the obstinacy of the Jews in their disbelief in heavenly portents, says:

When they were at any time premonished from the lips of truth itself, by prodigies and other premonitory signs of their approaching ruin, they had neither eyes nor ears nor understanding to make a right use of them, but passed them over without heeding or so much as thinking of them.³¹

And Nicephorus Callistus quoting the above words of Josephus continues:

But what then were these signs? A hairy star, very much like a sword, was seen shining above the city for a whole year. On the ninth of April, at the ninth hour of the night, the brightness of the light so illuminated the altar and the temple itself, that it appeared to be clear day; and this brightness lasted for a half-hour. The city gate facing east, made of solid brass, which on account of its tremendous weight was with difficulty closed by twenty men at twilight and then only with the aid of iron bars and long stakes planted in the ground, seemed to be opened of its own accord at the sixth hour of the night.

And he goes on to say that before sunset brilliantly shining clouds hovered above the city; and as the priests according to their custom were offering their nightly sacrifice, a loud voice told them of the coming ruin of their city. Jerusalem was captured the next year by Titus, the son of Vespasian. This was probably the comet described by Dio Cassius in speaking of the carefree enjoyment of pleasure by Vitellius. These are the words of his chronicle:

While he was behaving in this way, evil omens occurred. A comet star was seen, and the moon contrary to precedent appeared to have had two eclipses, being obscured by shadows on the fourth and on the seventh day. Also, people saw two suns at once, one in the west weak and pale, one in the east brilliant and powerful. On the Capitol many huge footprints were seen, presumably of some spirits that had descended that hill. The soldiers who had slept there the night in question said that the temple of Jupiter had opened of itself with great clangor and some of the guards were so terrified that they expired. . . . Vespasian's soldiers on ascertaining all these facts surrounded his tent and hailed him as emperor.

³¹ "Histories," Bk. VI.

The latter, when they talked to him about the comet which appeared during his sickness, replied that it referred to the king of the Persians, who had longer hair, as Aurelius Victor relates, or to the king of the Parthians, as Dio Cassius tells:

Portents had occurred in his career indicating his approaching end, such as the comet star which was seen for a considerable period and the opening of the monument of Augustus of its own accord. When the sick man's physician chided him for continuing his usual course of living and attending to all the duties that belonged to his office, he answered: "The emperor ought to die on his feet." To those who said anything to him about the comet he responded: "This is an omen not for me but for the Parthian king. He has flowing hair like the comet, whereas I am bald-headed." When at length he came to die, he said only: "Now I shall become a god."³²

Anna Comnenus ventures even beyond Josephus. He only rebuked other men for not believing so strongly as he did himself in the significance. But the judicious daughter of Alexis was good enough to approve of the wisdom which provided these portents. Speaking of a remarkable comet which appeared before the irruption of the Gauls into the Roman Empire, she says:

This happened by the usual administration of Providence in such cases; for it is not fit that so great and so strange an alteration of things as was brought to pass by that irruption of theirs should be without some previous denunciation and admonishment from heaven.

And Socrates the historian, speaking of the same subject, writes:

The tyrant (Gaius the Goth), simulating dissatisfaction, advanced to Chalcedon, whither the emperor Arcadius also went to meet him. Both then entered the church where the body of the martyr Euphemius is deposited, and there entered into a mutual pledge on oath, that neither would plot against the other. The emperor indeed kept his engagement, having a religious regard for an oath, and being on that account beloved of God. But Gaius soon violated it, and instead of abandoning his purpose, was intent on carnage, plunder and conflagration, not only at Constantinople, but also throughout the whole extent of the Roman Empire, if he could by any means carry it into effect. The city was quite inundated by the barbarians, and the citizens were reduced to a condition almost like that of captives. Moreover, a comet of prodigious magnitude, reaching from heaven even to earth, such as was never before seen, presaged the danger that was impending over it.

St. Augustine likewise gives a glowing account of the effects of this same comet.³³ He explains its appearance thus:

³² "History of the Romans," Bk. LXV., ch. 8.

³³ *De urbis excidio*, ch. 6.

God, wishing to terrify the city and by doing so to improve, purify and completely change its moral standard, came in a revelation to one of His faithful servants, to a soldier it is said, and told him that the city would perish by fire that would come from heaven. At the beginning of night, just as the earth was growing dark, a cloud of fire from the east was seen, at first small, and then little by little as it came up over the city it increased until the fire dangerously threatened the whole city. The dreadful flame seemed to hang there giving off a sulphurous odor. All fled to church, the place did not hold many; every one did his best to obtain baptism from whomsoever he could. Not only in the church, but even in the houses and in the streets, the safety of the sacrament was demanded; so that the future wrath, surely not the present, might be appeased.

Claudian supposes³⁴ the comet of 405, which he calls *audax stella* because it shone as bright at noon as Boötes does at night, to be a sign of the conquering of the Gauls by Stilicho.

Comets are said to have appeared at the deaths of Constantine, Attila, Valentinian and Mahomet. The list might very easily be extended to include many other celebrities, kings and Popes. In fact, so confidently did men believe that comets indicated the approaching death of great men, that they did not believe a very great man could die without a comet first appearing. So they inferred that the death of a very great man indicated the arrival, even if the comet chanced not to be visible. "A comet of this kind," says Pingré, "was that of the year 814, presaging the death of Charlemagne." He should have said, such was the comet whose arrival was announced by Charlemagne's death. It must be observed that some of the dates assigned to comets do not accord with the dates of the events associated with them. Thus, Louis le Debonnaire did not die in 837 when the comet appeared, but in 840. This, forsooth, is a matter of very little importance (!). If some men, after their comet has called for them, are "an unconscionable time in dying," as Charles II. said of himself, it surely must not be considered the fault of the comet. Louis himself regarded the comet of 837 as his death warrant; the astrologers admitted as much; what more could be desired? An anonymous writer of that time named "The Astronomer" gave the following details of its appearance, relative to the influence of it upon the imperial imagination:

During the holy days of the solemnization of Easter, a phenomenon ever fatal, and of gloomy foreboding, appeared in the heavens. As soon as the Emperor, who paid attention to these phenomena, received the first announcement of it, he gave himself no rest until he had called a certain learned man and my-

³⁴ "Fourth Consulship of Honorius," line 388.

self before him. As soon as I arrived, he anxiously asked me what I thought of such a sign; I asked time of him, in order to consider the aspect of the stars, and to discover the truth by their means, promising to acquaint him on the morrow. But the Emperor, persuaded that I wished to gain time, which was true, in order not to be obliged to announce anything fatal to him, said to me:

"Go on the terrace of the palace and return at once to tell me what you have seen, for I did not see this star last evening, and you did not point it out to me."

Then scarcely allowing me time to say a word, he added:

"There is still another thing you keep back; it is that a change of reign and the death of a prince are announced by this sign."

And as I advanced the testimony of the prophet who said, "Fear not the signs of the heavens as the nations fear them," the prince with his grand nature and the wisdom which never forsook him said:

"We must only fear Him Who has created both us and this star. But as this phenomenon may refer to us, let us acknowledge it as a warning from heaven."

Accordingly Louis gave himself up to fasting and prayer, and built churches and monasteries. But all was of no avail. He died three years later, in 840.

The year 1000 A. D. was by all but common consent regarded as the date assigned for the end of the world. For a thousand years Satan had been chained, and now he was to be loosened for awhile. So that when a comet made its appearance, and, terrible to relate, continued visible for nine days, the phenomenon was regarded as something more than a nine days' wonder. It was considered very wicked to doubt that the end of all things was at hand, but somehow the world escaped that time.

In April, 1066, Halley's Comet is said to have appeared to announce to the Saxons the approaching conquest of England by William the Norman. The chroniclers unanimously write: "The Normans, guided by a comet, invaded England." *Nova stella, novus rex*, was a proverb of the time. It was pretended that it had the greatest influence on the battle of Hastings, which delivered over the country to the Normans. A contemporary poet, alluding probably to the English diadem with which William was crowned, had proclaimed in one place "that the comet had been more favorable to William than nature had been to Cæsar; the latter had no hair, but William had received some from the comet." A monk of Malmesbury apostrophized the comet in these terms:

Here thou art again, thou cause of the tears of many mothers!
It is long since I have seen thee, but I see thee now, more terrible
than ever; thou threatenest my country with complete ruin.

The historian Nicetas describes the horrible aspect of the comet of 1182 thus:

After the Latins had been driven from Constantinople, they saw a prognostication of the madness and crimes to which Andronicus was to deliver himself. A comet appeared in the sky; like a winding serpent, it soon extended, coiled on itself, and, to the great terror of the spectators, it opened a vast mouth; they might easily have said that, thirsty for human blood, it was about to satisfy itself.

In the year 1305 "a comet of terrific dimensions made its appearance about the time of the feast of the Passover, which was followed by a Great Plague." It may be interesting to quote here Babinet's description of the effects ascribed in 1455 to Halley's comet, often the terror of nations, but the triumph of mathematicians, as the first whose motions were brought into recognizable obedience to the laws of gravity.

The Mussulmans, with Mahomet II. at their head, were besieging Belgrade, which was defended by Huniade, surnamed the "Exterminator of the Turks." Halley's comet appeared and the two armies were seized with equal fear.

Olmstead, in describing the same event, in his "Letters on Astronomy" says, as a bigot would say:

Pope Callixtus levelled the thunders of the Church against the enemies of the faith, terrestrial and celestial, and in the same Bull excommunicated the Turks and the comet.³⁵

Daru of the French Academy in his poem on astronomy tells us of this episode in terms which are none the less eloquent by reason of a similar slur on the Pope:

Another Mahomet hath raised with arm of might
The crescent banner o'er Constantinople's height:
At clash of spears, the frightened Danube thunders by;
Greece is in arms; all Europe hears the dread outcry;
And, as dire horror's height, the star with glowing face
And wings of fire across the western sky doth race.
Callixtus, at his altars that he knows not how
To guard, with tears in eyes and ashes on his brow,
The fear-inspiring comet conjures from the skies:
Look towards the heavens, Sovereign Pontiff, and arise!
The star pursues its journey and Huniade's blade
Arrests the conqueror, who falls before Belgrade.
Meanwhile this globe high in the azure skies, fore'er
By nature's universal law suspended there,
Heeds not these fears, nor Rome's existence, nor the Earth
Perchance nor name of man, who, credulous from birth,
Ambitious atom, trembleth at a priest's decree
And in the broad expanse of heaven his doom doth see.

³⁵ The authenticity of the alleged Bull is disproved in articles appearing in "The Month," February, 1907, and "Popular Astronomy," No. 148.

The comet of 1528 must have struck terror to the hearts of the beholders. Ambroise Paré, one of the most learned men of that time, writes of it as follows:

This comet was so horrible, so frightful, and it produced such great terror in the vulgar, that some died of fear and others fell sick. It appeared to be of excessive length and was of the color of blood. At the summit of it was seen the figure of a bent arm, holding in its hand a great sword, as if about to strike. At the end of the point there were three stars. On both sides of the rays of this comet were seen a great number of axes, knives, blood-colored swords, among which were a great number of hideous human faces, with beards and bristling hair.³⁶

The great comet of 1556 has been regarded as the occasion of the Emperor Charles V.'s abdication of the imperial throne. It appeared about the end of February and in March presented a terrible appearance, according to Ripamonte. It is of this comet that Sir John Herschel remarked:

Terrific indeed it might well have been to the mind of a prince prepared by the most abject superstition to receive its appearance as a warning of approaching death, and as specially sent, whether in anger or in mercy, to detach his thoughts from earthly things and fix them on his eternal interests. Such was its effect on the Emperor Charles V., whose abdication is distinctly ascribed by many historians to this cause, and whose words on the occasion of his first beholding it have even been recorded—*His ergo indicîis me mea fata vocant*—the language and the metrical form of which exclamation afford no ground for disputing the authenticity, when the habits and education of those times are fairly considered.

The comet of 1577 was remarkable for the strangeness of its aspect. It required only the terror with which such portentous objects were witnessed in the Middle Ages to transform the various streamers, curved and straight, extending from such an object, into swords and spears and other signs of war and trouble. Doubtless, we owe to the fear of the Middle Ages the strange pictures claiming to present the actual aspect of some of the larger comets. However, the astrological ideas began to be sharply attacked. "Yes," said Pierre Gassendi, at the beginning of the reign of Louis XIV., "the comets are really frightful, but through our own folly. We gratuitously fabricate for ourselves objects of panic, and, not satisfied with our real evils, we keep up imaginary ones." The learned Jacques Bernouilli himself was not free from prejudice in this regard, and he perpetuated it by saying that, if the body of the comet is not a visible sign of the wrath of God, the *tail* might well be.

In 1661 Madame Marie de Sévigné wrote to her daughter:

³⁶ The original is of course in French; the English rendering is my own.

We have here a comet which is of great extent; it has the most beautiful tail which it is possible to see. All the great personages are alarmed and believe that the sky, much occupied with their ruin, gives them warnings by this comet. They say that Cardinal Mazarin being despaired of by his physicians, his courtiers believed that it was necessary to honor his death agony by a prodigy, and told him that there appeared a great comet which made them fear. He had the strength to laugh at them, and told them pleasantly that the comet did him too much honor. Indeed, they should say it as much as he, and human pride did itself too much honor in believing that men may have business in the stars when they die.

The nobles in the court of Louis XIV. were not so wise as Mazarin. We read in the "*Chroniques de l'Oeil de Boeuf*," at the date of 1680:

All the telescopes have been pointed for three days to the firmament, a comet such as has not been seen in modern times occupies day and night the learned men of our Academy of Sciences. The terror is great in the town; timorous minds see in this the sign of a new deluge, considering, say they, that water is always announced by fire, which will not appear to me a demonstrative reason unless M. Cassini takes the trouble of confirming it. While the timorous make their wills, and, foreseeing the end of the world, bequeath all their goods to the monks (*sic*), the Court vigorously discusses the question whether the wandering star does not announce the death of some great personage, as it announced, they say, that of the Roman Dictator. Some free-thinking courtiers laughed yesterday at this opinion; the brother of Louis XIV., who apparently believes that he has become all at once a Cæsar, exclaimed with a very sharp voice: "Ah, sirs, you and others speak at your ease; you are not princes!"

It was to this comet that William Whiston attributed the Deluge. His theory was at first hypothetical, not applying to any particular comet; but when Halley determined the elliptical orbit of the famous comet of 1680, the theologian-astronomer no longer hesitated, but gave to the comet not only the part of destroying the human race by water, but, further, that of an incendiary in the future. When man had sinned, he said, a small comet passed very near the earth, and, cutting obliquely the plane of its orbit, gave it a motion of rotation. God had foreseen that man would sin, and that his crimes, reaching their consummation, would demand a terrible punishment; consequently, He had prepared from the moment of the Creation a comet which would be the instrument of His vengeance. This comet was that of 1680! Either on Friday, November 28, of the year of sin 2349, or on December 2, 2926, the comet cut the plane of the earth's orbit at a point from which our globe was distant but 9,000 miles. The conjunction happened when they reckon midnight at the meridian of Pekin, where Noah, it appears, lived before the

Deluge. A stupendous tide was produced not only in the waters of the seas, but also in those which may be found below the solid crust. And thus "the fountains of the great deep were broken up." Now, how will this comet, which the first time drowned the human race, be able to set fire to the earth at a second encounter? Whiston had no difficulty in explaining this: It will arrive behind us, retard the motion of our globe, and change its orbit. "The earth will be brought nearer to the sun; it will experience a heat of great intensity; it will be consumed. Finally, after the saints shall have reigned a thousand years on earth, regenerated by fire, and rendered again inhabitable by the Divine Will, another comet will strike the earth, the terrestrial orbit will be excessively elongated, and the earth becoming a comet, will cease to be habitable," reasoning rather hard to follow, surely.

This comet of 1680 inspired such terror that a medal was struck upon the continent of Europe to quiet apprehension. On one side was a picture of a comet falling through a number of stars, under which was the inscription: "Ao. 1680. 16 Dec.," and underneath this was "1681. Jan." On the reverse was this inscription: "Der Stern Droht Boese Sachen. Trav. Nur! Gott Wirds VVol. Machen." "The star threatens evil things; trust only! God will turn them to good." It was fear such as this which gave rise to the quatrain which the peasants and school children used to recite:

Eight things there be a Comet brings,
When it on high doth horrid range:
Wind, Famine, Plague, and Death to Kings,
War, Earthquakes, Floods, and Direful Change.

However, the old superstitions were removed in a light degree by Newton's discovery of the law of gravitation. Taught as men were that it was wicked to question what seemed to be the teaching of the Scriptures, that the heavens warned mankind of approaching troubles, and having very little knowledge regarding comets and meteors other than that there were such things in existence, it was not so easy as we imagine to shake off a superstition which had ruled over men's minds for thousands of years. Defoe, indeed, speaking of the terror of men at the time of the Great Plague, says that they "were more addicted prophecies and astrological conjurations, dreams, and old wives' tales, than ever there were before or since." The influence of strange appearances in the heavens on even thoughtful and reasoning minds, at such times of universal calamity, is well shown by Defoe's remarks on the comets of the years 1664 and 1666:

The old women and the phlegmatic, hypochondriacal part of the other sex, whom I could almost call old women too, remarked

that those two comets passed directly over the city and that so very near the houses, that it was plain they imported something peculiar to the city alone; and that the comet before the Pestilence was of a faint, dull, languid color, and its motion very heavy, solemn and slow; but that the comet before the Fire was bright and sparkling, or, as others said, flaming, and its motion swift and furious; and that accordingly one foretold a heavy judgment, slow but severe, terrible and frightful, as was the Plague; but the other foretold a stroke, sudden, swift and fiery, as was the conflagration. Nay, so particular some people were that, as they looked upon that comet preceding the Fire, they fancied that they not only saw it pass swiftly and fiercely, and could perceive the motion with their eye, but even that they heard it; that it made a mighty, rushing noise, fierce and terrible, though at a distance and but just perceivable. I saw both these stars, and must confess that I had so much the common notion of such things in my head, that I was apt to look upon them as the forerunners and warnings of God's judgment, and especially when, the Plague having followed the first, I yet saw another of the same kind, I could not but say, God had not yet sufficiently scourged the city.

An old English writer, Leonard Digges by name, observes:

Cometes signifie corruptions of the ayre. They are signs of Earthquakes, of warres, of chauning of kingdoms, great dearthe of corn, yea, a common death of man and beast.⁸⁷

Another remarks:

Experience is an eminent evidence that a comet, like a sword, portendeth war; and an hairy comet, or a comet with a beard, denoteth the death of kings, as if God and nature intended by comets to ring the knells of princes, esteeming bells in churches upon earth not sacred enough for such illustrious and eminent performances.

Henry IV. well remarked, when he was told that astrologers predicted his death because a certain comet had been observed:

One of these days they will predict it truly, and people will remember better the single occasion when the prediction will be fulfilled than the many other occasions when it has been falsified by the event.

There is perhaps nothing more remarkable in the whole history of cometary superstition than the panic which spread over France in the year 1773 in consequence of a rumor that the mathematician Lalande had predicted the occurrence of a collision between a comet and the earth, and that disastrous effects would inevitably follow. The foundation of the rumor was slight enough. It had simply been announced that Lalande would read before the Academy of Science a paper entitled "Reflections on those Comets which can approach the Earth." That was all. Lalande himself says in a memoir that he

⁸⁷ "Prognostication Everlasting" (2nd ed., London, 1576), folio 6.

had only spoken of those which, in certain cases, might approach the earth; but people imagined that he had predicted an extraordinary comet, and that this comet would bring about the end of the world. From the highest ranks of society the panic descended to the multitude, and it was generally believed that the fatal comet was on its way, and that our globe would cease to exist. Voltaire, in his deservedly celebrated "Letter on the Pretended Comet," says:

There is certainly no reason for laughing at M. Trissotin, triple idiot though he is, when he says to Madame Philaminte:

Nous l'avons en dormant, madame, échappé belle;
Un monde près de nous a passé tout du long,
Est chu tout au travers de notre tourbillon;
Et, s'il eût en chemin recontré notre terre,
Elle eut été brisée en morceaux comme verre.⁸⁸

We might easily find similar examples in the present century. An event happened in our time when the fear, so to say, seemed scientifically justified. In calculating the reappearance of Biela's comet, Damoiseau had found that the comet would, on October 29, 1832, before midnight, cross the plane of the earth's orbit at the only place where a comet would be likely to encounter the earth. These results, supported by all desirable scientific authority, were brought by the newspapers to the notice of the public. The end of time was near! The earth was about to be shattered, pulverized, annihilated by the shock of the comet! Such was the subject of all conversation. But it was calculated that the earth would not reach the same point until more than a month after the comet had passed it, so that the comet would pass at fifty millions of miles from the earth, as Arago wrote in the "Annuaire" for 1832.

The comet of 1861 occasioned more serious fears. It was held by many in Italy to presage a very great misfortune indeed, the restoration of Francis II. to the throne of the Two Sicilies. Others thought that the downfall of the temporal power of the Papacy and the death of Pius IX. were signified. The Civil War may be regarded by believers in this popular superstition as presignified by the great comet of 1861.

There was a considerable fright in November, 1872, when it was supposed that Biela's comet was about to strike the earth. The following dispatch from Atlanta, Ga., was printed in a daily paper:

The fear which took possession of many citizens has not yet abated. The general expectation hereabouts was that the comet would be heard from on Saturday night. As one result, the confessionals of the two Catholic churches here were crowded yesterday evening. As the night advanced there were many who insisted that they could detect a slight change in the atmosphere.

⁸⁸ Molière, "Femmes Savantes," act iv., scene 3.

The air, they said, was stifling. It was wonderful to see how many persons gathered from different sections of the city around the newspaper offices with substantially the same statement. As a consequence, many families of the better class kept watch all night, in order that if the worst came they might be ready to meet it. The orgies around the colored churches would be laughable were it not for the seriousness with which the worshipers take the matter. To-night (Saturday) they are all full, and sermons suited to the terrible occasion are being delivered.

If the progress of just ideas respecting comets has been slow, it must nevertheless be regarded as on the whole satisfactory. When we remember that it was not a mere idle fancy which had to be opposed, not mere terrors which had to be calmed, but that the idea of the significance of changes in the heavens had come to be regarded by mankind as a part of their religion, it can not but be thought a hopeful sign that all reasoning men in our time have abandoned the idea that comets are sent to warn the inhabitants of this small earth. Not only are they no longer regarded as presaging the fortunes of men on this earth, but men on this earth are able to predict their erratic fortunes. In the words of Beattie:

Fancy now no more
Wantons on fickle pinions through the skies,
But, fixed in aim, and conscious of her power,
Sublime from cause to cause exults to rise,
Creation's blended stores arranging as she flies.

HERBERT F. WRIGHT.

Washington, D. C.

EARLY RELIGIOUS DRAMA.

JUST as the earliest Greek plays were composed in honor of certain deities, so, too, was the earliest drama in England the product of the allegorical interpretation of nature sanctioned by Christian theology. The Romans had all the religious feelings required for the production of the drama, but lacked artistic imagination; and consequently their dramatic sense could be satisfied only with spectacles of materialism. All the orthodox representatives of Christianity were strong against *spectacula*. It is amusing to note that Arius alone went so far as pleading for even a Christian theatre. Christians were consoled by Tertullian for the loss of theatres in this world by the promise of a future spectacle of the exquisite and eternal bliss. The word "mystery" is doubtless derived from the Latin *ministerium*, and means "act." It is well known that the cradle of the mediæval drama was the Church. Its liturgy contains a multitude of germs for the formation of a drama; songs alternating between the priest and people; recitative reading in appointed parts, as in the story of the Passion, etc.

The contribution from the Middle Ages came largely from the religious drama. The folk games and plays and the performances of entertainers of various sorts contributed to the development of the drama principally on the side of comedy, and only incidentally to tragedy. Nor need the early centuries of the religious drama detain us. Its origin in the church service, its early liturgical forms, its growth and service in the hands of the Church, and its gradual secularization are of importance for us only as leading to its culmination in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; in England, notably in the great cycles of vernacular plays performed by the guilds. "It should be remembered, however," writes Professor Thorndike, "that the miracle plays never felt the least influence from the drama of the Greeks and Romans. Knowledge of the classic drama was long confined mainly to the plays of Terence, and suggested even to the most learned no idea of relationship to the familiar miracle plays; and, on the other hand, the mediæval stage gave no clue to a conception of the classical theatre. As late as Erasmus the curious notion survived that the classic plays were read by the author or a 'recitator' from a pulpit above, while below the actors illustrated his lines by pantomime. Almost to the middle of the fifteenth century the miracle plays comprised all that was known of stage presentation in connection with serious drama. They were still performed through the sixteenth century; the boy Shakespeare may have been a spectator at a performance by the guilds; his father and grand-

father and remoter forebears had seen them or perchance taken part in them."

The starting point of the modern drama is the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. The Waking of the Sepulchre anticipates some of the features of the miracle play, while the dialogue may have been suggested by the antiphonal elements in the church services, and specifically by the colloquy interpolated between the Third Lesson and the Te Deum at Matins, and repeated as part of the sequence *Victimæ paschalis laudes*, in which two of the choir took the parts of St. Peter and St. John, and three others in albs those of the three Marys. In the York Missal, in which this colloquy appears at length, its use is prescribed for the Tuesday of Easter Week. While Christianity was busily disinfecting the front halls, the most dreadful smells were starting again in the scullery.

As early as the fourth century, before she was yet able to triumph completely in the defeat of the pagan theatre, the Church began to show forth part of the greatest drama in the universe. The popular taste for dramatic productions was fed by their Easter celebrations. The antiphon, of Eastern origin, introduced into Italy by St. Ambrose, was the germ from which the mediæval drama developed. The altars made an easy setting for *Quem quaeritis*. The basis, however, of most of the Christmas plays is not the Scriptural, but the apocryphal narrative. In general, the plays were written to please as well as to edify; and, as they are preserved to us, the mysteries are true to the intention not to let a pleasantry pass without a modest burst of merriment. Nearly all the old plays hide under their archaic dress the human interest that all dramatic art, no matter how crude, can claim when it is touched with our real emotions and sensations.

It may be observed at the outset that instruction in those days, when reading was the privilege of the few, was apt to take the form of an appeal to the imagination rather than the reasoning faculty, and of all the aids to imagination none has ever been so effective as the drama. The Boy-Bishop celebration was not only the occasion of plays which sometimes necessitated the strong hand of authority for their suppression—it was distinctly dramatic in itself. Miracle plays represent a further stage of development, in which a rude and popular art shook itself free from the trammels of ritual, outgrew the austere restrictions of sacred surroundings, and yet kept fast hold on the religious tradition on which it had been nourished, and which remained to the last its supreme attraction.

The inventories of parish churches and the church-wardens' accounts which have survived show how very common a feature these plays of religion formed in the parish life of old England; and

they formed a powerful medium for teaching the simple and unlettered. For the religious drama was the handmaid of the Church, and was intended to instruct as well as to amuse.

The attitude of the clergy towards the dramatic performances which had arisen out of the elaboration of the services of the Church, but which soon admitted elements from other sources, was not, and could not be, uniform. As the plays grew longer, their paraphernalia more extensive, and their spectators more numerous, they began to be represented outside as well as inside the churches, and the use of the vulgar tongue came to be gradually preferred. Miracles were less dependent on this connection with the church services than mysteries proper; and lay associations, guilds, and schools in particular, soon began to act plays in honor of their patron saints in or near their own halls. The endeavor to sanctify the popular tastes to religious uses, which connects itself with the institution of the great festival of Corpus Christi (1264, confirmed 1311), when the symbol of the mystery of the Incarnation was borne in solemn procession, led to the closer union of the dramatic exhibitions (hence often called *processus*) with this and other religious feasts; but it neither limited their range, nor controlled their development.

Whatever we may think of the art of these literary works, they were dictated and presided over by a pious spirit. Says Cardinal Gasquet. "Any one who will take the trouble to read [such] plays . . . cannot fail to be impressed not only by the vivid picture of the special scene in the Old and the New Testament that is presented to the imagination, but by the extensive knowledge of the Bible which the production of those plays must have imparted to those who listened to them." And, even from the point of view alone, the plays cannot be regarded as worthless of Scriptural or moral teaching.

Another far-reaching inheritance from the miracle plays was derived from their treatment of tragic themes and situations and from their pervading seriousness of purpose. Their purpose was ethical and religious edification; their theme the tragedy of sin; their situations were derived from the stories of Cain, Lucifer, Judas, John the Baptist, the Slaughter of the Innocents, and the Crucifixion.

Now, it is evident that as the management of the plays fell more and more into secular hands, and as the "theatre" was removed from the church and its precincts to inn-yards and the public streets, the character of the compositions must become more profane and more human, and must at last cease to have any very definite religious value. The approach of the true drama began as soon as the representations were brought into the market-places and to the fairs.

In such plays there is much life, much movement, but no growth and very little plot—no feeling of fitness in the grouping of the persons; but we recognize the gift for characterization, which is perhaps the highest natural literary gift found among our race. What had formed at first a part, or merely an episode, was later elaborated into an independent story, and soon the language was influenced. By degrees the dramatic desire of making the exhibition as real and lifelike as possible prevailed over the symbolical motive, and therefore could not be conveniently combined with a service in church.

The "Miracle," definite in scope, varied in setting, and not bound too narrowly by the cords of orthodox tradition, might conceivably have developed into a national tragedy, as it did in Spain. The mystery was not capable of such an evolution. But the favor it enjoyed in the fifteenth century was incredible. The mysteries, although still under Church control, became great civic functions. They were entrusted to special associations or brotherhoods, like the Passion players of St. Maur, near Paris. The age, in spite of the miseries of war, was fond of pompous display: the sacred dramas were performed even in beleaguered cities. Indeed, they were considered as "pious works" rather than as a recreation, and might help to avert an impending catastrophe. There was first a parade of the actors, in their hundreds, through the streets of the town. Then they reached the elaborate stage on the cathedral square. This was a veritable microcosm, setting forth heaven above, hell all agape and belching flames, and the earth in between. The earth was divided into many scenes or "mansions"—Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Egypt, the Golgotha—and the artists would move with the action from one part of the stage to another. Crude ingenuity was shown in the use of machines: angels were seen floating in mid-air, with means of support invisible to the eyes of faith. Such was the conscientious realism of the setting that the actor impersonating Christ had to suffer great hardship during the protracted Crucifixion scene, and that Judas was in personal danger at the hands of an uncritical populace. The plays were tremendous in duration as well as in scenery and personnel. The Passion of Arnoul Greban (c. 1450) contained no less than 35,000 lines, that is to say, the equivalent of ten to fifteen modern tragedies. Jean Michel, a few years later, recast parts of Greban's work, and expanded it to 50,000 lines.

The earliest "miracle play" mentioned in England was the work of Geoffrey Le Mans, afterwards Abbot of St. Albans, who composed it at Dunstable, in honor of St. Katherine, probably before the close of the eleventh century—so Matthew Paris tells us. A passage in Fitzstephen's "Life of Archbishop Becket" shows that such plays were common in London about 1180. These were evidently miracle

plays, though in England the distinction between miracles and mysteries was not made. Of the former class, in the strict meaning of the word, nothing is preserved in English literature. The oldest extant miracle play in English is the "Harrowing of Hell" (thirteenth century). This poem was intended to be delivered by a professional wandering *jongleur*. If, however, Ten Brink's date is correct, the earliest purely English drama was a play about "Jacob and Esau." Until quite a late period the authorship of the several dramas was unknown, though there are several remarkable coincidences between the Chester plays and the French "Mystère du Vieil Testament."

"The manner of these plays," we read in a description of those at Chester, dating from the close of the sixteenth century, "were: Every company had his pageant, which pageants were a high scaffold with two rooms, a higher and a lower, upon four wheels. In the lower they appareled themselves, and in the higher room they played, being all open at the top, that all beholders might hear and see them. The places where they played them was in every street. They began first at the abbey gates, and when the first pageant was played, it was wheeled to the high cross before the mayor, and so to every street, and so every street had a pageant playing before them at one time till all the pageants appointed for the day were played; and when one pageant was near ended, word was brought from street to street, that so they might come in place thereof, exceedingly orderly, and all the streets have their pageants afore them all at one time playing together; to see which plays was great resort, and also scaffolds and stages made in the streets in those places where they determined to play their pageants."

There is no probability that the stage was, as in France, divided into three platforms with a dark cavern at the side of the lowest, appropriated respectively to the Heavenly Father and His angels, to saints and glorified men, to mere men, and to souls in hell. But the last-named locality was frequently displayed in the English miracles, with or without fire in its mouth. The costumes were in part conventional—divine and saintly personages being distinguished by gilt hair and beards, Herod being clad as a Saracen, the demons wearing hideous heads, the souls black and white coats according to their kind, and the angels gold skins and wings.

Doubtless these performances abounded in what seem to us ludicrous features, and though their main purpose was serious, they were not in England at least intended to be devoid of fun. But many of these features are in truth only homely and *naïf*, and the simplicity of feeling they exhibit is at times not without its pathos. The occasional excessive grossness is due to an absence of refinement of

taste rather than to an obliquity of moral sentiment. In this, as in other respects, the Coventry Plays, which were possibly written by clerical hands, show an advance upon the others. In the same plays is already to be observed an element of abstract figures, which connects them with a different species of the mediæval drama.

The oldest extant "morality plays" belong to the time of Henry VI.; although we have a record of one, called the "Play of Paternoster," probably performed first of all in the reign of Edward III., at York. The performance of the York miracle plays went on until 1579. The Newcastle celebration outlasted them by about ten years. The Chester Plays were acted until the end of the sixteenth century, and those of Beverly till 1604. What killed the miracle play? This is a deeply interesting speculation, but one with regard to which it is difficult to form a conclusion owing to the coexistence of rival influences, the relative strength of which cannot well be estimated. We have seen that Puritan opinion suspended the miracle play at Ashburton during the reign of Edward VI., and it would be natural to look for the same result from the accession of Elizabeth, whereas, at Beverly, it was maintained all through the period of her rule. The oldest vernacular dramas written in England belong not to English but to French; the play of "Adam" and that of the "Resurrection," though the oldest dramatic poems in the French language, were, according to general opinion, composed in England in the twelfth century.

The "Manuscript 617" of the library belonging to the Condé Museum at Chantilly, was written in the fifteenth century by the hand (at least in part) of "Soeur Katherine Bourlet," a nun of the convent of St. Michel at Huy. From a close study of the text Professor Cohen assumes that the plays were composed in the district northeast of Liège. These plays, which we now have probably in the form they were represented before the "Dames Blanches," are as follows: (The conjectured dates are those given by M. Cohen.) (1) "Jeux d la Nativité Jhesuschrist," originally composed in the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century, but almost certainly altered for the nuns and played before them between 1466 and 1469. (2) A fragment of another Nativity, composed in the second half of the fourteenth century, but altered as above. (3) "Jeux des VII. Pechié Morteil et des VII. Vertus," a long and wearisome production, dated between 1380 and 1420. (4) "Une jeux à VI. personnage," a short morality, introducing Faith, Prudence, Loyalty, Love, Honor and Peace. (5) "Jeux de Pèlerinage Humaine," a long morality, abridged from the still longer work of Guillaume de Deguileville, written in 1331, altered in 1350, and copied after 1484, though the present version dates from the second half of the fourteenth century.

Its chief interest for us is its position as a far-off predecessor of Bunyan's allegory.

Certain districts gained celebrity for the zeal and efficiency of their performances. York (Towneley), Wakefield, and Chester in the North, and Coventry in the Midlands, were the chief centres of attraction. The plays began at an earl hour, after Mass; and the chief day seems to have been the feast of Corpus Christi (the first Thursday after Trinity Sunday).

Intimately connected with the social side of the mercers' fraternity was the pageant play, which on Corpus Christi day was enacted in various parts of York. Originally the mercers themselves took part in the representations, but their civic and social importance forbade such diversions in the fifteenth century, and professionals were introduced to take their place. The first reference to this annual merrymaking in the merchants' records is in the account roll for 1437. The pageant, that is the movable stage similar to the Punch and Judy erection of modern times, needed a new curtain; whether the 6s. paid for the making included also the tapestry of which it is made is not clear. Seventeen shillings and eightpence is also paid for torches to be carried in the procession of Corpus Christi, possibly by the chaplains, for the procession was under the management of the clergy, the pageant of the trades of York. "Payd for the makynge of the awrres of the pagent hous, vjs. Item, payd to Margret Chaundeler for makynge of vj torchys and the wax to them, xiijs. Item, for vj castylls to them, ijs. viiijd. Item, payd to David Paynter for xxiiij baners wyth canvas hangyng thereto, and peynting of vj castyls, xs." But in 1453 the mercers concluded local talent was not sufficient to bring out the play. An agreement was made with Robert Hewyk, parish clerk of Leeds, Thomas Fitt, tapiter, and Henry Clayton, weaver, to bring out the pageant of "Domysday," for which they were to receive a payment of ten pounds. Doubtless this covered all the expenses, such as fees to players, expenses of representation, repairs and renewal of properties, otherwise the payment would seem excessive. The first definite list of the stage properties of the mercers belongs to the same period; "kakkeys and ale" cost 4½s. A cryptic entry, "v yerddes of now canways to j now pagand that was mayd for the sollys to ryse out of," seems to mean that new canvas had to be bought for making clouds out of which the redeemed souls could rise to heaven, while the unredeemed were thrust into the lowest compartment, with the dramatic condemnation:

"Ye cursed kaitiffs from me ye flee,
In helle to dwelle withouten ende,
There ye shall nevere butt sorowe see
And sitte by Satanas the feinde."

Nails, laths, ropes, rushes, ironwork, sacks mending, angels' wings, chaplets, are all entered, but the largest item is fees to the players, "to the players thorow the tone iiijd. payd for playing, xviijs. ijd." The entry, where the first appointment of pageant masters is mentioned, is of uncertain date.

There is, however, a complete list of pageant masters of York from 1526 to 1642, four for each year, but their duties changed as Catholicism waned, for Puritanism turned a stern face on such frivolities. Whatever ambiguity there may be about the date of the episode, the fact that the mercers either in addition to their play of Doomsday or instead of it took over all the ornaments and produced the play of "Paternoster," is clear. As in 1399 this play had belonged to a guild of more than one hundred members and their wives, and was so well known that its renown had reached Wycliff's ears, it would be interesting to find out why it was suddenly appropriated by the mercers. It continued to be played at intervals; the final attempt at a revival in 1580 was unsuccessful owing to the opposition of the Archbishop. There are no further allusions to the pageant until 1502, when Thomas Drawswerd was admitted into "the broderheid of the fraternitie of the Holy Trinity" without paying a fee, on condition that he "shall mak the pagiant of the Dome belonging to the merchaunts of new substancialie in everything thereunto belonging, having for the workmanship and stuff of the same, vij marces in money and his entrie fre, with also the old pagiant." The family of Drawswerd had for three generations been engaged in working alabaster and marble, as imagers in York. The new pageant probably had images of angels placed in the interior, otherwise it is difficult to understand why Drawswerd should have been asked or consented to undertake the work. For his workshops had more than local fame; he was requested to compete for the figures on the tomb of Henry VII. in Westminster. It has been suggested that the figures on the quire screen at York were his work, or rather his design, carried out under his supervision in his workshops; for the days has passed when designer was executor. He carved the screen at Newark about 1508. In 1526 another list of properties is given, but it does not leave the impression that the mercers were keenly interested in their pageant: "ij dewells cotte, ij devell hedde, j wesseren, j chartt the cloud, ij grett angells wants j wing, ij trompets, hell dure, iiij angelli, pagand dure, iiij wendows, the iren set with iiij roppe, the wheels with j rope, the trenettie hus, ij lyttell angelles, the viij chyffs, ix nailes, the trenitte wants j chartt, iij wessezons, j rope, j angell. Wants j lyttel angell and ij nalls." This list certainly lends color to the suggestion that the pageant made by Drawswerd was decorated with figures, whether of wood

or alabaster it is impossible to say. It is a dreary picture of dilapidation, the great angels which want one wing is pathetic, the absence of one little angel heartrending. The cloud would probably be the painted representation of the clouds and great glory in which the Judge would sit, forming a background to the upper part of the pageant.

As early as Lent, the best actors the town could furnish were selected. A first rehearsal would be held in Easter week, and a second in Whitsun week. No player was allowed to take more than three parts.

The earlier English moralities—from the reign of Henry VI. to that of Henry VII.—usually allegorize the conflict between good and evil in the mind and life of man, without any side intention of theological controversy; such also is still essentially the purpose of the morality we possess by Henry VIII.'s poet, the witty Skelton, and even of another, perhaps the most perfect example of its class, which in date is already later than the Reformation. But if such theology as "Everyman" teaches is the orthodox doctrine of Rome, its successor, R. Wever's "Lusty Juventus," breathes the spirit of the dogmatic reformation of the reign of Edward VI. Theological controversy largely occupies the moralities of the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign, and connects itself with political feelings in a famous morality. Sir David Lyndsay's "Satire of the Three Estaitis," written on the other side of the border, where such efforts as the religious drama proper had made had been extinguished by the Reformation. Only a single English political morality remains to us, which belongs to the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth. Yet another series connects itself with the ideas of the Renaissance rather than the Reformation, treating of intellectual progress rather than of moral conduct; this extends from the reign of Henry VIII. to that of his younger daughter.

The costumes were more magnificent than appropriate. The players condemned themselves to labors to which few of our contemporaries would care to submit. In some "Passions" the person who represented the Christus had to recite nearly four thousand lines. Moreover, the scene of the Crucifixion had to last as long as it did in reality. It is related that in 1437 the Curé Nicolls, who was playing the part of Our Lord, at Metz, was on the point of dying, and had to be taken down from the cross in haste; while another, who was playing the part of Judas, remained hanging so long that his heart failed.

At Canterbury the chief play was naturally "The Martyrdom of St. Thomas." The cost is carefully entered in the municipal account books—charges for carts and wheels, flooring, hundreds of nails, a

mitre, two bags of leather containing blood which was made to spout out at the murder, linen cloth for St. Thomas' clothes, tin foil and gold foil for the armor, packthread and glue, coal to melt the glue, alb and amys, knights' armor, the hire of a sword, the painting of St. Thomas' head, an angel which cost 22d. and flapped his wings as he turned every way on a hidden winch with wheels oiled with soap. When all was over the properties of the pageant were put away in the barn at St. Sepulchre's nunnery, and kept safely till the next year at a charge of 16d. The Canterbury players also acted in the "Three Kings of Cologne" at the Town Hall, where the kings, attended by their henchmen, appeared decorated with strips of silver and gold paper and wearing monks' frocks. The three "beasts" for the Magi were made out of twelve ells of canvas distended with hoops and laths, and "painted after nature"; and there was a castle of painted canvas which cost 3s. 4d. The artist and his helpers worked for six days and nights at these preparations, and charged three shilings for their labor, food, fire and candle.

The writers of these plays recalled not only the events of this world, but depicted before their audience the terrors and hopes of the next. The greatest celebration in which a city could indulge on a solemn occasion was to play the Passion. When this took place, nearly all the inhabitants crowded into a large theatre (for a play occupied anything from two to five hundred people); the city was deserted, and it was necessary to organize bands of armed citizens to protect the deserted houses against robbery. In Paris, this custom endured to 1548, when the authorities forbade the *Confrères de la Passion* to play. Incidentally, we may say that the best-known modern survival is that of Ober-Ammergau; and the earliest idea of it seems to have come from Siena (1200) and Padua (1240).

Miracle plays died out in France and England in the sixteenth century, but in Cornwall, as we have seen, they continued to be played down to the beginning of the seventeenth century, and in Brittany almost down to our own time. "The Great Mystery of Jesus," modernized and otherwise altered, was in great repute in the eighteenth century. One of the widest known and most popular mysteries which have come down to modern times is that of St. Tryphine and King Arthur. The language is more modern than in the two plays above mentioned, and is largely mixed with French expressions, hence we did not include it among Middle-Breton documents. The Breton miracle plays, as well as the Cornish ones, are free to a great extent from the disgusting realism, coarse expressions and indecent buffooneries of the English and French plays of the fifteenth century.

Towards the commencement of the twelfth century, French play-

wrights fastened on the miracles of the saints as their special themes, and, by force of habit, the English public in ensuing generations retained the description, though subjects had come to be chosen other than the marvels of martyrology. Dr. Ward would limit the term "miracle play" to those dramas based on the legends of the saints, and would describe those drawn from the Old and New Testaments as "mysteries" in conformity with Continental usage. The distinction is logical, but its acceptance would practically involve the sacrifice of the former term, since the Dunstable play of St. Catherine, the plays founded on the lives of St. Fabyan, St. Sebastian and St. Botolph, which were performed in London, and those on St. George, acted at Windsor and Bassingbourn—no others are recorded—have all perished.

Like the modern musical drama of Wagner, "Der Ring," some of those curious old productions lasted for days. For instance, in the reign of Richard II., in 1384, the "clerks" of London gave "a very sumptuous play" at Skinnerwell. In nearly all the plays in England, as also in Germany, the chief interest was tragic; and this was in accordance with the temperament of the nation, which was as yet untouched by the gayety of France, which is the gayety of Chaucer. And, in a less restricted sense, pageants received a fresh impulse in the Renaissance age; and in the time of Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth they enjoyed a popularity essentially secular in theme.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the dramatic representations of the chief mysteries of religion and of scenes in the life of Our Lord and of His saints served to impress the truths and events upon the imaginations of the audiences that witnessed them, and to make them vivid realities. The plays were generally acted on a Sunday or feast-day. "Spectacles, plays and dramas that are used on great feasts," says the author of "Dives et Pauper," "as they are done principally for devotion and honest mirth, and to teach men to love God the more, are lawful if the people be not thereby hindered from God's service or from hearing God's word, and provided that in such spectacles and plays there is mingled no error against the faith of Holy Church and good living."

Both the literary and the professional element had thus survived to become tributaries to the main stream of the early Christian drama, which had its source in the liturgy of the church itself. The service of the Mass contains in itself dramatic elements, and combines with the reading out of portions of Scriptures by the priest, its epical part, a lyrical one in the anthems and responses of the congregation. At a very early period—certainly already in the fifth century—it was usual to increase the attractions of public worship on special occasions by living pictures illustrating the Gospel narra-

tive and accompanied by songs; and thus a certain amount of action gradually introduced itself into the service. When the epical part of the liturgy was connected with its spectacular and to some degree mimical adjuncts, the lyrical accompaniment being of course retained, the liturgical mystery—the earliest form of the Christian drama—was in existence. This had certainly been accomplished as early as the tenth century, when on great ecclesiastical festivals it was customary for the priests to perform in the churches the offices (as they were called) of the Shepherds, the Innocents, the Holy Sepulchre, etc., in connection with the Gospel of the day. In France in the twelfth, or perhaps already in the eleventh century, short Latin texts were written for these liturgical mysteries; these included passages from the popular legend of St. Nicholas as well as from Scriptural story. In the same century the further step was taken of composing these texts in the vernacular—the earliest example being the mystery of the Resurrection. In time a whole series of mysteries was joined together; a process which was at first roughly and then more elaborately pursued in France and elsewhere.

The theory of Copernicus had been in print since 1543, but the drama clings to the Ptolemaic theory.

Nash speaks in 1596 of the theory of Copernicus as of a paradox fallen into disrepute, and the Devil in Marlowe's "Doctor Faustus," when questioned by the Doctor on several matters connected with astronomy, shows that his conception of them is still based on the Ptolemaic system. . . . Shakespeare, especially, never fails to show himself an adherent of the old theory of the universe, and all attempts to prove any connection between his plays and Giordano Bruno's world of thought are beside the mark. These attempts are the work of German scholars who assumed, perhaps involuntarily and certainly unhistorically, that the intimate connection between poetry and contemporary science which characterized the great period of German literature was also characteristic of the Elizabethan dramatists.

Of the skepticism of Montaigne, well known though he was to English playwrights, not a trace appears in their drama. If they laugh at alchemy and astrology, which were not protected by the Church, they accept ghosts and devils, and especially witches. England officially believed in witches; and, especially after the accession of James I., such protests as those of Wier and Reginald Scot were likely to be of little weight against the official view. And Shakespeare, gentle Shakespeare, in order to flatter his sovereign, lends his countenance to the belief that had caused so much abominable cruelty. Whether he held that belief is another matter; he at least did not appreciate his responsibility in lending it his support.

Any dramatist bold enough to take liberty with Christian dogma, in the way ventured by Euripides in his treatment of the Greek national faith, would have caused both Church and State to repress him sternly. Although devoid of any sense of historical perspective, the dramatist had no qualms about representing the Deity on the stage. Certain characters appear frequently in a stereotyped mould; thus Noah's wife is always the typical scold, and the amenities of the Ark are but reflections upon the social life of the day, shrill-voiced wives and long-enduring husbands. Herod, again, is always represented as a roaring, ranting potentate. Scenes of comedy were provided at the devil's expense. While to us some of the provisions and situations may seem grotesque enough, and at times even approach to irreverence, there is no doubt whatever that the people for whom they were designed received them at first with pious enthusiasm and seriousness. Horse-play and buffoonery or racy comedy often contrasted incongruously with events of momentous importance. This mixture of the comic and tragic survived in the popular drama despite the opposition of the humanists. It was indeed characteristic of mediæval and Elizabethan manners and taste, and marks another important departure from classical precedent. We to-day are perhaps as near to the Athenians as to the Elizabethans in this respect.

The labor of production and the services of the actors were for the most part voluntary, and the proceeds went to help the common parish purse in providing for the poor. The "pageants were organized," says Bishop Stubbs, in his "Constitutional History of England," "for the relief of distress as well as for conjoint and mutual prayer. It was with this idea that men gave large estates in land to the guilds, which down to the Reformation formed an organized administration of relief." The plays were allotted as much as possible to the work of the guilds; thus we find that the shipwrights presented the scene of the building of the Ark; the fishmongers and mariners were responsible for the play of Noah in the Ark; the goldsmiths and money-lenders stage the visit of the Kings of the East with their presents to the Infant Christ. No expense was spared in making the plays successful, and the guilds vied with one another in their respective shares of the production.

The whole town was made to serve as a huge theatre, and the many pageants proceeded in due order from station to station. "The place," says Archdeacon Rogers—he is speaking of Chester—"the place where they played was in every streete. They begane first at the abay gates and when the first pagiant was played, it was wheeled to the highe crosse before the mayor, and so to every streete; and soe every streete had a pagiant playinge before them at one time,

till all the pagiantes for the daye appoynted weare played; and when one pagiant was neere ended word was broughte from streete to streete, that soe they might come in place thereof excedinge orderlye, and all the streetes have their pagiantes afore them all at one time playeing togeather to see which playe was greate resorte, and also scafoldes and stages made in the streetes in those places where they determined to playe their pagiantes."

Should the supply of pageants be limited, different scenes were acted in different parts of the same stage; and actors who were awaiting or had ended their parts, stood on the stage unconcealed by a curtain. In more elaborate performances a scene like the "Trial of Jesus" involved the employment of two scaffolds, displaying the judgment-halls of Pilate and Herod respectively; and between them passed messengers on horseback. The plays contain occasional stage directions—e. g. "Here Herod shall rage on the pagond." We find also rude attempts at scene-shifting, of which an illustration occurs in the Coventry Play of "The Last Supper":

"Here Cryst enteryth into the hous with his disciplis and ete the Paschal lomb; and in the mene tyme the cownsel hous beforn seyde al sodeynly onclose, shewynge the buschopys, prestys and jewgys.

The stages or "pageants" on which the acting took place are described as high "scaffolds," with two rooms, and occasionally a third. In the lower, the players apparelled themselves; on the top they acted. The word "pageant," which appears to be etymologically related to the Greek is technical in respect of Miracle Plays, and, in this connection, is thus defined by Archdeacon Rogers:

"A high scafolde with two rowmes, a high and a lower, upon four wheeles. In the lower they apparelled themselves, and in the higher rowme they played, beinge all open on the tope, that all behoulders might heare and see them."

The pageants were constructed of wood and iron, and so thoroughly, that it was seldom that they needed to be renewed. In the floor of the stage were trap-doors covered with rushes. The whole was supported on four or six wheels so as to facilitate movement from point to point; and as the Miracle Plays were essentially peripatetic—within, at least, the bounds of a particular town, and sometimes beyond—this was a very necessary provision.

Each pageant had its company. The word "company" here is not exactly synonymous with "gild," for several gilds might combine for the object of maintaining a pageant and training and entertaining actors, and the composition of the company varied according to the wealth or poverty, zeal or indifference, of different gilds. Thus it came to pass that the number of pageants, in the same city, was subject to change, companies being sometimes subdivided, and

at other times amalgamated; and in the latter event the actors undertook the performance of more scenes than would otherwise have fallen to their share. Commonly speaking, there was probably no lack, whether of funds or players, at any rate as regards the principal centres. On the day of the performance, each pageant would be taken from its shed and dragged to the first of the "stations" at which the plays were acted. The first performance being over, the whole show would be taken to another place, and there repeated. At York, each play was acted twelve times; the choice of the stopping-places being determined by the liberality of the owners of the adjacent houses. As these performances were not under the immediate protection of the Church, contributions were much needed; since sums varying from fourpence to four shillings, according to the ability of the actors, were paid to them. The outlay on these plays was necessarily large, and the accounts of gilds and corporations prove that not only were considerable sums expended on the dresses of the actors, but the latter received fees for their services. The fund needed to meet these charges was raised by an annual rate levied on each craftsman—called "pageant money." The cost of housing and repairing the pageant, as well as the refreshment of the performers at rehearsals, would also come out of this fund. As the actors were paid, they were expected to be efficient, and the duty of testing their qualifications was delegated either to a pageant-master or to a committee of experienced actors. A York ordinance dated April 3, 1476, shows that four of "the most cunning, discreet and able players" were summoned before the Mayor during Lent for the purpose of making a thorough examination of plays, players and pageants, and "insufficient persons," in whatever requirement—skill, voice or personal appearance—their defect lay, were mercilessly "avoided." No single player was allowed to undertake more than two parts on pain of a fine of forty shillings. If the scenery was immovable, it was very rich with secrets of mechanism. Two or three trees would represent a forest; although the action sometimes changed from place to place, the scenery did not alter. From 1416 to 1591 there is not the slightest indication that the clergy in any way co-operated in the composition of the plays; however, if they are not of an ecclesiastical origin, they at least show a distinct influence of ecclesiastical minds.

The productions of the mediæval religious drama it is usual technically to divide into three classes. The mysteries proper deal with Scriptural events only, their purpose being to set forth, with the aid of the prophetic or preparatory history of the Old Testament, and more especially of the fulfilling events of the New, the central mystery of the Redemption of the world, as accomplished by the

Nativity, the Passion and the Resurrection. But in fact these were not kept distinctly apart from the miracle plays or miracles, which are, strictly speaking, concerned with the legends of the saints of the Church; and in England the name mysteries was not in use. Of these species the miracles must more especially have been fed from the resources of the monastic literary drama. Thirdly, the moralities, or moral plays, teach and illustrate the same truths; not, however, by direct representation of scriptural or legendary events and personages, but allegorically, their characters being personified virtues or qualities. Of the moralities the Norman *trouvères* had been the inventors; and doubtless this innovation connects itself with the endeavor, which in France had almost proved victorious by the end of the thirteenth century, to emancipate dramatic performances from the control of the Church.

Perhaps the chief difference between the miracle and the morality plays was that the first merely exhibited a series of isolated scenes to illustrate a doctrinal thesis, while the latter worked out the purpose of their allegory by means of a continuous plot. This is particularly the case in the play called "Everyman": the dramatist no longer relied on the narrative of Scripture, but was forced to invent his own plot; and, looking to the plays of Plautus and Terence, learned, no doubt, how to make the story turn on the human interest of the situation. This fifteenth century morality play not only forms one of the completest and most compact allegories that have ever been written; its morality, besides being a masterpiece of clear and direct expression, at the same time remains open to challenge from remarkably few ideas that have arisen since. The overwhelming fear of hell that the minds of men dwelt upon in the Middle Ages is sharply outlined and accentuated; but the means suggested for avoiding that hell might equally well have been advocated by Shelley or by Tolstoy. In addition to this—and perhaps even more remarkable in view of the outward crudity of the situations and the irregularity of the verse—the play is capable of being given a completely satisfactory and even impressive performance by modern actors to a modern audience.

The Belgian monk who did all this undertook also to give a fairly comprehensive summary of the Catholic faith as interpreted by the fifteenth century, with the vanity of early power and riches, the doctrine of redemption by confession, and the value of good deeds. He made "Everyman" a symbol of the human race; he made God's voice proclaim His intentions towards "Everyman" from behind the stage; he brought all the virtues on to the stage as characters, Felawshyp, Dyscrecion, Beaute and so on; and he hit off his little

problem in the inside of an hour and a half with a boldness and a simplicity that have kept the play fresh for centuries.

In the text as we have it there are still traces of great beauty in the poetry. Much of it is rough and crude and charms merely by the naïve appeal of its primitiveness, but in such moments as Everyman's acceptance of the scourge as a symbol of penance it rises to a height or real richness and passion.

The use of realistic details as a mode of vivification introduced a spirit of secularization; and the early drama was at last brought, through the interlude, to the very verge of the modern play. The most famous of all moralities is "Everyman," whose date of composition can not be defined exactly. It has been thought that the author got his idea of the play from the famous book published by Caxton in 1492, entitled "*Ars Moriendi*." As early as 1495, a Dutch translation was printed, "*Elckerlijck*." Whoever its author was, he was a man of profound imagination, with a tender, human soul.

Except for the Protestant moralities that carried out the spirit of the Reformation and for a few plays in the drama of the twentieth century, the English drama has always been conservative, reflecting the accepted and official views of morality and belief. The marvel of the Elizabethan drama is the riotous freedom with which the dramatists were able to create ebullient and infinitely various life within these limits. Shakespeare, and Shakespeare alone, shows some desire to present a philosophy of life. He goes so far, in "Hamlet" and "Lear," as to reject deliberately the "poetic justice" offered him by the original on which he was working, and to show the inevitable tragedy of character and circumstance. But Shakespeare always seems to be above the limits that he imposes on himself or accepts from convention and authority. Dr. Creizenach characteristically points out the significance of Sir Toby's words to Malvolio: "Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" It is true that the contest between theatre and Puritan had not reached its bitterest when that line was written; but the gentleness of the complete reply, the proof of superiority that it bears within itself, are all Shakespeare's. In the same manner, however daring his speculations concerning life and fate, he could carry them on without running tilt against received opinions, because his mind worked on planes where it mattered not what people in general thought or did not think about forms of religion, science, or what not. That superiority is the other face of his power to tickle the groundlings with obscene jesting, yet to preserve throughout his plays a purity that is above incitement to vice.

In Germany, on the other hand (the history of whose drama so widely differs from that of the Spanish), religious plays were performed probably as early as the twelfth century at the Christmas and Easter festivals. Other festivals were afterwards celebrated in the same way, but up to the Reformation Easter enjoyed the preference. About the fourteenth century miracle plays began to be frequently performed; and as these often treated subjects of historical interest, local or other, the transition to the barren beginnings of the German historical drama was afterwards easy. Though these early German plays often have an element of the moralities, they were not as in France blended with the drolleries of the professional strollers (*fahrende Leute*), which, carried on chiefly in carnival time, gave rise to the Shrove-Tuesday plays (*Fastnachtsspiele*), scenes from common life largely interspersed with practical fun. To these last a more enduring literary form was first given in the fifteenth century by Hans Rosenplüt, called Schnepferer — or Hans Schnepferer, called Rosenblüt—the predecessor of Hans Sachs. By this time a connection was establishing itself in Germany between the dramatic amusements of the people and the literary labors of the *master-singers*; but the religious drama proper survived in Catholic Germany far beyond the times of the Reformation, and was not suppressed in Bavaria and Tyrol till the end of the eighteenth century.

No doubt the whole idea of enforcing truths and lessons which it is its object to convey was drawn from the stories and allegories of the Bible. A great part of the Testament depends on an interpretation proceeding on this assumption. Therefore, the moralities suggest the wings as proper names of the designations of abstract qualities. Parts of the vision concerning "Piers Plowman" and "The Pearl" illustrate these tendencies. It must be noted that the moralities concern themselves directly with the prevalent tone of the literature of the age which produced them; on the other hand, the mysteries had been out of touch, generally speaking, with the learning of the schools. "Everyman" was probably taken from the "Legenda Aurea," by Jacobus Voragine (d. 1298), and the eighth-century work of John of Damascus—"Barlaam and Jehoshaphat." The play is the production of Catholic piety, and reflects the efficacy of the mediating influence of the Blessed Virgin and the help of the Sacraments; and, by a consensus of opinion, is regarded as the flower and crown of the literary species to which it belongs.

CLAUDE C. H. WILLIAMSON.

London, England.

VENERABLE DON BOSCO.

II.

THE new Oratory was inaugurated on Easter Sunday, April 12, 1846, when it was blessed and dedicated under the invocation of St. Francis de Sales by Don Bosco, who celebrated Mass, attended by many youths from the vicinity and other persons from the city; the Archbishop, to testify his satisfaction, renewing the faculties he had already given him. It was a very modest edifice, a sort of shed, about three feet high at one end and a little higher at the other. When he first entered it, he had to be very careful to avoid knocking his head against the low roof. The floor was damp ground, and when it rained it was filled with loughs of water. Rats infested it and bats fled around his head. Yet the good man was satisfied. "This shall be the chapel," he said. "It will be poor, like the stable at Bethlehem." It was transformed in a week. Workmen dug out the soil, the walls were strengthened, and lofts were erected. Don Bosco, his boys and the owner lent a hand. Two poor rooms behind the altar served as sacristy and repository. It was the second chapel of the Oratory and was used for divine worship for about six years. But his "dreams" were confirmed; he was established in the place reserved for him through the goodness of Our Lady.

More youths and little boys were attracted in various ways to the Oratory until their numbers increased to 700; and several ecclesiastics who had abandoned it returned. Lay helpers supported him with their money and personal service. The boys became more assiduous and orderly. "It was marvelous," relates Don Bosco, "the way in which a multitude of whom I knew little at first and of the greater portion of whom it might be truly said that they were *sicut equus et mubus quibus non est intellectus*, behaved. It should be added, however, that in the midst of that great ignorance I was struck with their great respect for the things of the Church, for its sacred ministers, and a great eagerness to learn the dogmas and precepts of religion."

Pinardi, in making some improvement, dug up a good deal of earth which formed a heap of a few paces from the chapel, upon which the boys used to play at soldiers. To some one who urged him to have it removed, Don Bosco answered: "It will be removed another time when in this very place will be built a large chapel." As a number of boys were chanting a solemn air, he imposed silence and said: "My dear children, listen to a thought that has come into

my mind. Here where we now are some day or other will rise the high altar of our church, to which you will come to receive Holy Communion and sing the praises of the Lord." Five years afterward the church was begun, and the high altar erected in the very spot pointed out by Don Bosco, although the architect who designed it was unaware of this.

Notwithstanding the order, discipline and tranquillity that reigned in the Oratory, the Marquis Cavour persisted in regarding this assemblage of boys dangerous and wanted to disperse them. He again sent for Don Bosco, to whom he said: "My dear Abbé, it is time to put an end to it; and, since you have not thought it convenient to take my advice, I am constrained, for your good, to put in force my authority and require the closing of your Oratory." "Pardon me, Marquis," replied Don Bosco, "but I think it my duty to respectfully repeat that if the Oratory should be closed it is to be feared that God's malediction would fall upon me and you." While the Marquis displayed great animosity, the priest displayed dignified courage. The former was resolved to carry his point, and, unable to get the Archbishop to forbid Don Bosco the exercise of his ministry, hoped to have the Oratory closed by a formal condemnation by the municipal authorities. In this he failed; but, still hostile, he sent again for Don Bosco, to whom he said: "You are working with a good intention, but the good you are doing is full of danger. On the other hand, I am obliged to safeguard public peace; henceforth I shall have yourself and your assemblies overlooked. At the first compromising act I shall have your rogues dispersed, and you shall be accountable to me for whatever may occur." It was the last time they met, for subsequently the Marquis was suddenly stricken with an attack of gout which, after much suffering, took him to his grave. Meanwhile every Sunday some civic guards spent the day at the Oratory, spying everything that was done within and without the church, but instead of hearing or seeing anything to find fault with, were much edified. Finally the Marquis was satisfied with the explanations given him, recognized the utility of these gatherings for the moral benefit of youth, and promised to let the Oratory alone.

Don Bosco fell ill. The Marchioness Barolo, fearing that his brain was weakening, wanted him to have some months of absolute rest in a salubrious atmosphere, and offered him a sum of 5,000 lire for the purpose. While thanking her for her charitable offer, he said: "I did not become a priest to take care of my health." She was not satisfied. She had seriously hoped that, going away from Turin for a long time, he would forget all about his boys, who had troubled her by the noise they made, and she decided, in her own mind, that he should only concern himself with her institutions.

"Absorbed in her own works," comments Father Lemoyne, "she had not understood the spirit of Don Bosco, as she had not known how to understand that of the Venerable Giuseppe Benedetto Cottolengo. She put before him the alternative of giving up the Orationary or his chaplaincy of her hospital, giving him time to think of it before answering. "My answer is already thought out and I am ready to give it to you now," he replied. "You have much money and means, and you will find as many priests as you wish to take charge of your institutes. It is not so with the poor boys, and I cannot and ought not abandon them. If that was done the fruit of many years would be lost. Therefore henceforth I shall willingly do what I can for the Refuge, but shall give up my regular office to devote myself more to my work for the boys." "Then you prefer your vagabonds to my Institutes?" she exclaimed. "If so, you are dismissed from this moment. I shall procure your successor this very day." He observed that such a precipitate proceeding might give rise to suspicions, and it was agreed there should be a delay of three months, during which, through the medium of Silvio Pellico, her secretary, and Don Borel, she renewed her proposition; returning to the charge directly or indirectly. Once when she visited the humble chapel, it seemed to her still more inexplicable that he should refuse her generous offer. "What can you do here?" she said, "if I do not come to your aid? I know you haven't a penny! And with all that won't you accede to my proposal? So much the worse for you! Think well before deciding it: it concerns your whole future!" Another time she said to him: "You are in great straits, is it not true?" "Oh, no!" he replied affably, but looking grave and reserved. "I didn't come to talk to you of money! I know your intentions and I don't wish to disturb you, the more so as I don't need anything and—if you will permit me to say it without intending to offend you—I have no need of you either, Signora Marchesa!" "Really, eh?" she said. "Here's a proud man!" "No," he said quietly, "I don't seek your money and though you know I am necessarily straitened and don't make a move to help me, I am of quite a different mind towards you. So, making an inadmissible supposition, if the Signora Marchesa should fall into poverty and needed my help, I would take the mantle off my shoulders and the bread from my mouth to succor her." The lady was for a moment confused; but presently, with her customary vivacity, pursued: "I know it, I know it, that you persist in not having need of me and not wanting my favors! Canon Cottolengo, too, did the same, he did not want my money!"

It also grieved the Marchioness to see the failure of her pet project of forming a kind of congregation of priests to whom she wished

to confide her establishments with Don Bosco, who possessed the necessary gifts to realize it, as its director; she, so powerfully supported by the King and all the authorities, her wealth, the nobility of her family, the popularity she acquired by her beneficence, could not but feel baffled at the insuperable resistance of Don Bosco. With all that, she was an eminently pious lady and really sincerely humble, for she always knelt and asked his blessing at his coming and going. He had, however, decided at the end of three months, to leave the hospital, which meant relinquishing his apartments at the Refuge.

In addition to his apostolate among youth, to which he was so self-sacrificingly devoted, he found another sphere for the exercise of his indefatigable zeal and ardent charity in ministering to prisoners under sentence of death, his exhortations being extraordinarily efficacious. In the midst of this very trying mission he was stricken with a grave illness which threatened to be fatal. The last sacraments were administered and the boys, divided into squadrons, alternately kept vigil from morning till night in the sanctuary of the Consolata, praying to Our Lady to preserve the life of their loving father and friend, in which they were joined by his mother and his brother Joseph, who hastened from Becchi to Turin. One night, which looked as if it would be his last, Don Borel prevailed upon him to pray for his own recovery. To console him, he said in a feeble voice: "Lord, if it be pleasing to You, cure me"; while, as he himself narrates, he mentally prayed thus: "*Non recuso laborem*; if I can be of service to some soul, O Lord, at the intercession of Your most holy Mother, be pleased to restore me to such health as may not be contrary to the good of my soul!" "That is enough," said Don Borel, "now I am certain she will cure you!" A short time afterwards he fell into a sleep from which he awoke out of danger, as if restored to a new life. Doctors Botta and Cafasso, on coming to pay their morning visit, not without fear of finding him dead, felt his pulse and said: "Dear Don Bosco, thank Our Lady of Consolation, who has taken good care of you." There was great rejoicing, particularly among the boys, at this unexpected recovery. They wept for joy, Don Bosco mingling his tears with theirs. When he reappeared in the Oratory he said to them: "I thank you for the proofs of love you have given me during my illness; I thank you for the prayers offered for my cure. I am persuaded that God has granted me life at your prayers; and, therefore, gratitude requires that I should spend it all to your advantage. I promise to do so as long as the Lord shall leave me on this earth, and do you on your part help me." There was exposition of the Blessed Sacrament and they chanted the *Te Deum* in thanksgiving. Then he went to Castelnuovo and Becchi

to recuperate ; until, warned in one of his "dreams" of the backsliding of two of his boys who relapsed into a disorderly life, he returned to Turin, accompanied by his mother, who he declared was a saint, and who said to him: "My dear son, you may imagine how much it affects me to leave this house, your brother and the other dear ones, but if it appears to you that such a thing may please the Lord, I am ready to follow you." They made the journey together on foot in the primitive manner, discoursing of God and divine things. It was November 3, 1846. The apostle of youth, destined to perform prodigies of charity for the glory of God and the salvation of souls, was at last free to carry out that admirable programme which to human eyes seemed daring, even impossible. "If rich, you shall not see me!" his mother had said. But now, seeing him sacrificing himself for the poorest, piously and generously she followed him. The holocaust of mother and son could not be more complete.

He next busied himself, *inter alia*, with the organization and coördination of his schools in which were taught Christian doctrine, sacred history, languages and music, the experiment being very successful, so that Professor Rayneri of the Royal University, said: "If you wish to see teaching admirably put in practice go to the Oratory of St. Francis de Sales and observe what Don Bosco is doing." The City Council, after sending a commission to investigate them, set aside an annual subsidy of 300 lire "for the schools of the poor children of the people,"¹ and the Cavaliere Gonella, director of the Mendicittà istruita, was so impressed by the method of teaching that he obtained from the administrators of that pious institution 1,000 lire to be used by Don Bosco for the advantage of the schools and the benefit and encouragement of the pupils. It being the first time in Italy that were opened public schools of music and that singing was taught in classes to many pupils simultaneously, it excited much interest and curiosity. When the pupils were sufficiently instructed they formed choirs who sang in theatres and churches. This initial school produced musicians of notable ability, not a few clever organists, and a hundred other schools that enhanced its reputation; while the Turin local authorities voted Don Bosco a prize of 1,000 lire for his promotion of music. "The encouragements I received from the civic and ecclesiastical authorities—among whom King Charles Albert and Monsignor Franson continued to be in the first line—the zeal with which many persons came to my aid with temporal means and the coöperation, are an indubitable sign," he records, "of the blessings of the Lord and the public approbation of men."

¹ Regularly paid until 1878 when, without any reason assigned, it was stopped.

But the teaching of Christian doctrine was uppermost in his mind and his *primum motor*. His zeal for its teaching was marvelous. He would roam the streets and squares, go into lodging houses, cafés, shops and ascend the scaffoldings of houses and mansions in process of construction to beg the contractors and foremen to send their boys to catechism. People would stop to look at this unusual sight, and while the one exclaimed, "Is that priest mad?" others would ask, "Whoever can he be?" to which some one would answer: "Oh, it's Don Bosco in search of boys!" Shortly after noon during the days of Lent a boy would get hold of a big bell and go ringing it round about the Oratory. Its sound, penetrating into the houses, would remind the occupants of the duty of sending the youngsters to catechism, and in a few minutes troops of boys would be crowding from all parts and inviting other boys to join them to the Oratory. To stabilize on an organic basis the discipline and administration of the Oratory, he instituted the Company of St. Louis, for the mutual edification of the boys, that by the frequentation of the Sacraments and giving each other good example they might become confirmed in virtuous living. The Archbishop, who approved of it by a rescript of April 12, 1847, wished his own name to be the first enrolled. Don Bosco compiled for them a pious manual called "Il Giovane Provveduto."

The enemy of all good could not behold so much being done in the way that saints do it without venting his rage, which he did by nightly noises, to the great detriment of poor Don Bosco's health; but when he prayed to the Blessed Virgin he was freed from this disturbance. His room was regarded by all the boys as a sanctuary in which Our Lady was pleased to make known to him her will. His mother, who was of the same opinion, had removed her bed into the room adjoining his, persuaded that he spent part of the night in prayer and suspecting that, then took place something surprising which she could not well define. She told the boy Giacomo Bellia that once, in the small hours before dawn, she heard her son talking in his room and some one answering; she listened, but could understand nothing. In the morning, although she was certain no one could have got in, she asked him who he was talking to, and he answered: "I talked with Luigi Comollo." "But Comollo is dead years ago!" she said.² "Still it was so," he replied, without giving any other explanation. His face was as red as fire, his eyes sparkled; it was evident that a great overmastering idea was in his mind, and he was agitated with an emotion that lasted for more than a day.

² He died on April 2, 1839, aged 22.

But more surprising was the fact he narrated himself for the first time, seventeen years after it took place. One evening, in 1864, after the conferences he was wont to give in his anteroom to members of his Pious Society, having spoken of detachment from the world and one's family to follow our Lord's example, he continued: "I have already told various things in the form of a dream from which we may conclude how much the most holy Madonna loves and helps us; but since we are here alone by ourselves, that every one of us may be assured that the Virgin Mary favors our Pious Society and that it may animate us to labor still more for the glory of God, I shall tell you not now the description of a dream, but what the Blessed Virgin herself was pleased to make visible to me. She wishes that we should put our trust in her. I am speaking to you in all confidence, but I wish that what I am going to tell you be not divulged to others of the house or outside the Oratory in order that it may not give malignant critics something to talk about. One day in the year 1847, having meditated much on the way of doing good, particularly to the advantage of youth, the Queen of Heaven appeared to me and led me into an enchanting garden. There was a rustic, but very beautiful and large portico in the form of a vestibule. Trailing plants adorned it and festooned the pilasters, and branches very rich in foliage and flowers stretching above the one towards the other their tops and interlacing, spread over it like a handsome veil. This portico led to a beautiful avenue, upon which one saw in the distance a bower charming to look upon, supported and covered with marvelous roses in full bloom. The ground was also completely covered with roses. The Blessed Virgin said to me: 'Take off your shoes!' And when I had taken them off, she added: 'Go forward to that bower, that is the way to reach it rapidly.' I was glad to have put off the shoes, for I would have been sorry to trample those roses, they were so lovely. I began to walk, but suddenly I felt that those roses concealed very sharp thorns, so that my feet bled. Then, having gone hardly a few paces, I was obliged to stop and retrace my steps. 'We want shoes here,' I said to my guide. 'Certainly,' I was answered, 'we want good shoes.' I put on my shoes, and resumed my way with a certain number of companions who made their appearance at that moment, asking to accompany me. They kept behind under the arbor, which was of incredible loveliness; but as I advanced it appeared narrow and low. Many branches arose lofty and rentouted like festoons, others hung perpendicularly above the path. From the stems of the roses other branches spread out here and there at intervals horizontally; others formed sometimes a thicker hedge, obstructing a part of the way; others wound a little higher from the ground. They were, however, all covered with roses,

and I saw nothing but roses at the sides; roses above and roses between my steps. While I felt acute pains in the feet and sometimes hesitated, I touched the roses here and there and felt that thorns still sharper were concealed under them. Nevertheless, I went forward. My feet got entangled in the branches resting on the ground and remained stuck there; I removed a transversal branch that obstructed my progress, but to get clear of it grazed the back and pricked myself and was bleeding not only in the hands, but over the whole body. The roses which hung above concealed a great quantity of thorns that stuck into my head. However, encouraged by the Blessed Virgin, I pursued my way; but, from time to time, was pierced with punctures more acute and penetrating, which gave me a still more painful spasm. Meanwhile all, and they were very numerous, who saw me walking through that garden, said: 'Oh! how Don Bosco is always walking over roses; he is advancing very quietly; all is going well with him.' But they did not see the thorns that lacerated my poor limbs. Many clerics, priests and laity whom I invited set about following me joyfully, allured by the loveliness of those flowers; but when they realized that they had to walk over prickly thorns and that these protruded everywhere, they began to cry out, saying: 'We have been deceived!' I answered, 'Whoever wants to walk pleasantly over roses, go back; let the others follow me.' Not a few went back. Having gone a good part of my way, I turned to glance at my companions. But what was my grief when I saw that a portion of these had disappeared and another had already turned their backs on me and withdrawn. I at once retraced my steps to call them back, but in vain, for they would not listen to me. Then I began to lament and complain excessively, saying: 'Is it possible that I must traverse all this weary way alone? But I was soon consoled. I saw advancing towards me a troop of priests, clericals and seculars, who said to me, 'Behold us; we are all yours, ready to follow you.' I preceded them, leading the way; only some lost courage and stopped, but a large portion went with me to the end. Having traversed the whole length of the garden, I found myself in another very pleasant one, where my few followers, all attenuated, ruffled and bleeding, surrounded me. Then a fresh wind arose, and by its breath all were cured; another breath of wind and as by enchantment I found myself encircled by an immense number of youths and clerics, lay helpers and also priests, who set to work along with me in guiding those youths. I recognized several by their features, many I did not yet know. Presently, having reached an elevated place in the garden, I saw before me a monumental edifice surprising in the magnificence of its architecture and, crossing its threshold, I entered a very spacious hall of such magnificence that

no palace in the world could boast of its equal. It was all strewn and adorned with thornless roses in full bloom, from which emanated a most delightful fragrance. Then the Blessed Virgin, who was my guide, asked me, 'Dost thou know what all thou now seest and hast seen signifies?' 'No,' I replied, 'I pray you explain it to me.' Then she said to me, 'Know that the way traversed by thee amid roses and thorns signifies the charge thou hast of taking care of youth; you must make your way with the sandals of mortification. The thorns on the earth represent sensible affections, the human sympathies or antipathies that distract the teacher from the true end, injure him, stop him in his mission, hinder him from proceeding and attaining the crown of eternal life. The roses are the symbol of the ardent charity that should distinguish thee and all thy helpers. The other thorns signify the obstacles, sufferings and unpleasantnesses that you encounter. But do not lose courage. With charity and mortification thou wilt overcome everything and reach the thornless roses!' The Mother of God had hardly finished speaking, when I came to myself and found myself in my room."

The servant of God concluded by affirming that after that he clearly saw the path he was to tread; the opposition and artifices with which they would try to stop him were revealed to him, and that though he would have to walk through many thorns, he was certain of the will of God and of the success of the great undertaking confided to him.

He next addressed his attention to a phase of rescue work which strongly appealed to him and to his mother, called by his boys "Mamma Margherita." Many little Turin boys and strangers to the city, well disposed to lead moral and industrious lives, were in want of food, clothing and temporary shelter. For one of these, a homeless orphan, who had come from Valesia in search of work and was penniless, and had nowhere to go, they improvised a bed in the kitchen. "This," writes Father Lemoyne, "was the first bed and the first dormitory of the Salesian Hospice in Turin, which was to reach and contain more than a thousand rescued ones." Mamma Margherita, who had a homely talk with this first orphan boy on the necessity of work, fidelity and religion, introduced the very useful practice maintained in the Oratory and extended to all the Salesian houses, that of impressing every night before they retired to rest some good word or thought on the minds of the inmates.

At the close of 1847 a new Oratory was opened in the vicinity of the Porto Nuova and was dedicated to St. Louis Gonzaga, the angelic patron of youth, who was also the name saint of Archbishop Frasoni, a tower of strength to Don Bosco's work, which he upheld through good and evil report. The new Oratory had to encounter

snarcs and difficulties, but from the first feast days there was a marvelous rush of boys.

At this time Don Bosco's mind was sadly preoccupied. One day as he was celebrating Mass at the Institute of the Good Shepherd, and was at the elevation, a Sister gave a loud cry which disturbed the whole community. He, too, was very much impressed, and the Sister came to ask him to excuse her for the disturbance she caused. "What did you see?" he inquired. "Jesus in the host in the form of an infant dripping with blood," she answered. "And what would that mean?" he queried. "I don't know," she said. "Know," said he, "that it indicates that a great persecution of the Church is being organized."

Troubled times were near. They were on the eve of a revolutionary epoch. The next year, 1848, was to be signalized by insurrections in Ireland, France, Prussia, Austria and Italy. Pius IX. in Rome and Charles Albert in Sardinia thought to stem the torrent by concessions to the liberal movement which had begun to transform Europe; but it broke down every breakwater, every barrier. The Supreme Pontiff, more saint than statesman—who stood at the parting of the ways, when the receding old order was about to give place to the new—saw his benevolent efforts foiled and had to flee to Gaeta. Mazzini and Garibaldi set up their short-lived Roman Republic in the City of the Popes, which was desecrated and demoralized. Don Bosco, by his tact and firmness, avoided being drawn into the whirlpool and vortex of politics, as he continued to do all through his life, and had his reward in his relations with the civil power which, though at first it put obstacles in his way, ended by recognizing the great public service he rendered the State by his social reforms. Faithful to the Papacy, he taught the boys when, in the beginning of his Pontificate, the name of Pius IX. was greeted with tumultuous applause, not to cry *Viva Pio Nono!* but *Viva il Papa!* for certain people wished to separate the Sovereign of Rome from the Pontiff, the man from his divinely bestowed dignity. Again, when on February 8 Charles Albert promulgated his promise of a measure to give effect to civil reform, and the Turin authorities proposed to celebrate it with a public function, and the Marquis Roberto d'Azeglio invited Don Bosco to participate along with his boys. He refused, saying that he resolved to keep aloof from everything that had reference to politics. Urged by some members of the Council to manifest his own opinions and to do something that would please the liberal party, he gave a non-committal reply. To refuse would be construed into a declaration of enmity to Italy, to agree would imply the acceptance of principles which he judged fraught with disastrous consequences; therefore, he neither approved nor disapproved.

Though they said, "Don't you know that your existence is in our hands?" he remained firm.

Soon after there were hostile demonstrations against some religious orders and cries of "Death!" were heard under the windows of the refectory of St. Francis of Assisi and of the Marchioness of Barolo's. From the Pinardi house they heard the indecent clamors of drunken men, ready for mischief, and of abandoned women who poured out all sorts of insults against the Refuge, threatening to drive the inmates out and burn it. Don Bosco then ran the greatest risks. A shot, aimed at his heart, was actually fired at him from a wall one Sunday when he was catechizing the boys, but it failed to hit its mark. A universal outcry followed the detonation; then profound silence. With pallid faces all the boys fixed their eyes on the servant of God. The bullet had torn his cassock and sleeve and spent itself against the chapel wall. With great composure and presence of mind, to quell the indescribable terror this sacrilegious outrage had aroused among the boys, he smilingly remarked: "What! are you afraid of a bad joke? It is a jest and nothing more. Certain ill-instructed people never know how to make a joke without offering offense. Look! they have torn my cassock and spoiled the wall! But let us turn to our catechism."

He got to know who his would-be assassin was. Meeting him one day he reflected that, if he showed he knew all about him—and he was a scoundrel guilty of other misdeeds—he would not have the courage to approach him, fearing denunciation. He asked him what motive impelled him to play such an ugly joke. Surprised, but not humiliated, the wretch replied: "I wanted to see if the gun would make a good shot . . . against the wall of your house." "You're an unfortunate fellow!" said Don Bosco, "however, I forgive you from my heart and wish to be your friend!"

The political tumult outside had its reverberation within the Oratory. Piedmont had declared war on Austria, and between enthusiasm for war aroused by its proclamation and enthusiasm for liberty evoked by the new statute minds were everywhere in a whirl of excitement. The boys, particularly the grown lads, caught the contagion which was fostered in every *borgo* by Associations of Youth, called in the local dialect *Cocche*. Every one who was for the war took sides against those who were opposed to it, with the result that the two factions had often pitched battles. In one of these near the Oratory Don Bosco intervened; but, finding words unavailing to quell the clamor and separate the combatants, determined to stop it at any cost. Endowed with strength of muscle as well as strength of will, he threw himself into their midst, while projectiles of all kinds were flying about, and put both the bellig-

erents to flight; thus putting an end to the disorder. "I remained master of those fields," he says, "and no one ventured to return." Then he pondered: "What have I done? I might have been hit by one of those stones and stricken to earth. But neither in this or in similar cases has any evil consequence befallen me, except once when I received a blow of a wooden shoe in the face and bore the mark of it for some months. When one relies on the goodness of his cause, he need fear nothing. I am made like that; when I see God offended, to hinder it I would not retire or yield, even if I had to face an army against me."

They invaded the region of Valdocco, and he often went into the midst of the tumult, the stones sometimes striking him on the shoulders or the limbs; but the cry, "Here's Don Bosco, here's Don Bosco!" was enough for the greater portion to disperse and for the others to gather round him. While he spoke to them, the already open blades of knives, were concealed in sleeves, and the stones dropped silently down from the hand. The Waldenses, abusing the liberty accorded to them by the edict of June 19, sought to make proselytes. The first to taste the bitter fruits of this emancipation were Don Bosco and the Oratory of St. Louis, not far from which the heretics spread their snares. On the first Sunday fifty of the five hundred boys who frequented the Oratory fell away, enticed into the enemy's camp; on the second Sunday the biggest boys made themselves the guardian angels of the younger; and on the third Sunday only thirty or forty made their appearance in that camp. The boys obediently returned like lambs into their own fold. The enraged heretics besieged with volleys of stones the Oratory, which looked like a fortress they wanted to take by assault. The eldest boys lost patience and, despite every danger, sallied out and drove the assailants off with the same missiles. This scene was renewed for months.

A far different scene was witnessed at the Oratory of St. Francis de Sales on the celebration of the feast of St. Louis when the procession was headed by a young artisan carrying a banner, the tassels being held by two youths of the noblest families, while at either side of the statue were seen two notable personages, one of whom held in his hand a lighted taper, and the other the *Giovane Provveduto*, and both sang, along with the sacred ministers, the hymn, "Infensus hostis gloria," in honor of St. Louis. They were the Marquis Gustavus and Count Camillus Cavour. The Marquis wished to be enrolled in the Company of St. Louis and, kneeling before the altar in the midst of the boys, read in a loud voice the formula of aggregation. The two brothers, seeing how Don Bosco had the ability and constancy to overcome so much opposition, became his

admirers. They often visited him, and there was no feast of any importance at the Oratory in which they did not take part. They delighted to see so many boys playing peaceably, well instructed and well treated, rescued from evil ways, and at such a sight Camillus often exclaimed: "What a grand and useful work is this! It would truly be desirable that there was one at least in every city; thus many boys would escape imprisonment; and Government would not have to spend so much money in keeping them in jail, and would have instead many well trained citizens, who, with a handicraft or trade, would lead honest lives."

The work of the Oratories, which gained such high recognition, had then triumphed. It was in full bloom, but there were still thorns beneath the rose leaves. All his associates did not think as he did. One day two priests, attached to the Oratory of St. Louis, where the boys had resisted the allurements of the proselytizers with such constancy in the faith, asked for permission to lead these very boys with banners and the tricolor cockade through the streets. He refused. Joined by others, they declared themselves openly against Don Bosco, and the next Sunday led out the boys of the Oratory of the Porta Nuova. Afterwards an effort was made at the Valdocco Oratory to get the boys to drop the Catholic paper, the *Armonia*, for the liberal *Opinione*. When he was addressing his juvenile auditors, he was interrupted for half an hour with shouts of "Emancipation, independence, liberty!" A rebellious squadron of about a hundred boys were led into revolt, Don Bosco having dispensed with the aid of the hitherto co-workers, who made all this trouble. The latter detached all the big boys from him. Priests and clerics for one motive or another abandoned him, with one or two exceptions, notably Don Borel. Censorious tongues criticized his conduct with unsparing hostility. Carlo Gastini, an orphan in the Valdocco Hospice, heard him say: "All are abandoning me, but I have God with me, and whom should I fear? The work is His and not mine, and He will think of carrying it on." He did. All the boys, little by little, returned. He had the patience and faith of the saints and he had their reward. In the midst of all these trials he remained heroically tranquil. His "dreams" and the vision of the garden of roses had prepared him for them. After the return of the young prodigals, the number of boys increased.

While perfect peace prevailed at Valdocco, some of his coöperators, fearing that renewal of the recent disturbances would ruin a work so well begun, proposed that the existing Oratories and those that might be founded should be formed into a confederation governed by a kind of assembly; but Don Bosco, who had other views, would not approve of it. "Then," observed Durando, a learned priest of the

mission, "you mean to found an ecclesiastical congregation." "Be it a congregation, be it what you like, I want to erect Oratories, chapels, churches, catechism classes and schools, and without a person to help me I can do nothing." "But how can you undertake such a thing? You will want sites and money in abundance." "Not merely wanting! We desire them. And they shall be ours." Durando went away, saying there was no reasoning with him.

It was among the boys he sought and found the first collaborators and continuators of his work. In 1849 he selected seventy out of the hundred who frequented the Valdocco Oratory and got them to make the spiritual exercises to see if any of them would show signs of a vocation to the priesthood. He took four, to whom he said: "I want to collect boys who are willing to take up the work of the Oratory along with me. Will you consent to be my assistants?" "In what way can we help you?" they asked. "We will begin to form a little elementary school," he answered. "I will there teach you the first rudiments of the Latin language, and if such be the will of God, who knows but in time you may become priests." When a third Oratory was added, that of Valdocco became like the Seminary of the archdiocese and of Piedmont, and was such for twenty years, so that a large number of these boys, through the zeal and at the expense of Don Bosco, were enabled to pursue the usual course of studies, receive ordination, and become priests in various dioceses.

The work went bravely on. The Minister of the Interior was petitioned to subsidize it. A commission of three Senators was sent to Valdocco in January, 1850, to report on it. They found more than five hundred boys on the playground. "What a beautiful sight!" exclaimed Count Sclopio. "Beautiful indeed!" responded the Marquis Pallavicini. "Fortunate Turin!" added Count Collegno, "if several such institutes should be raised within it!" "Then pursued Sclopio, "our eyes would not so often be confronted with the disagreeable sight of so many wretched youths scouring the streets and squares on festive days, growing up in ignorance and evil ways." The greatest praise was given to Don Bosco. "His work," exclaimed Sclopio, "is truly philanthropic and of great social importance. The government ought to promote and support such works; and for his comfort I tell him that the Intendant and all the royal family appreciate this work and will give it their protection." "These are miracles of Catholic charity," declared Palavicini. "Signor Don Bosco," said Count Sclopio, as he was taking his departure, "I am not wont to use flattery, but with all the sincerity of my heart, and in the name of my colleagues, I confess to you that we are leaving, highly satisfied; and as Catholics and citizens and Senators of the Kingdom we applaud your work and wish it may prosper and extend." The

proposal received the approval of the Senate; and from that day the Oratory and Hospice were favorably regarded by the government, which sent them subsidies. During a local disturbance arising out of the Constitutional Charter, when the populace were about to make a descent upon Valdocco, one of the demonstrators, who had had experience of Don Bosco's benevolence, harangued them, saying: "Hear me, my friends! Some would wish to go down to Valdocco to groan Don Bosco. Take my advice and don't go. Being a working day, you'll only find with him his old mother and some poor rescued boys. In place of crying out, 'Death to him!' we should cry out, 'Long life to him!' for Don Bosco loves and helps the children of the people!" Another added: "Don Bosco is not a partisan of any one! He is a philanthropist! He is a man of the people! Let us leave him in peace! Let us not go to him to cry out 'viva!' or 'morte!' and let us go elsewhere." These words stopped the tumultuous crowd which went to deafen the ears of the Dominicans and Barnabites.

Count Camillus Cavour was then all for the Oratory, and it was wonderful to see how the servant of God had the support of personages otherwise seemingly adversaries of the Church, or rather of the temporal power of the Papacy. At first sight it might seem that their large promises of help for his pious undertakings, their proffers of signal honors, their granting of many of his requests would dangerously put to the test his piety, fidelity to the Holy See and his religious principles. But Don Bosco, with heroic fortitude and without a shadow of human respect, always remained the most faithful supporter of the Church's cause, which is the cause of God. Count Camillus not only often visited him, but had him frequently at his table as an honored guest. "I was not too easily induced to take my seat at the Count's table, notwithstanding his pressing invitations: but as I sometimes had to treat with him on important affairs, it was necessary that I should go to his house or that of the Minister," he notes. "But often, when he was already Minister, he told me resolutely that he did not wish to give me audience at dinner or lunch hour, and that when I needed some favor from him there was always a place for me at his table." This was because they could there converse with greater freedom than in the official residence or offices, where there were too many people. His brother, the Marquis Gustavus, fixed the same time for his receptions.

Don Bosco founded in Turin the first conference of the St. Vincent de Paul Society on the model of the parent establishment in France, begun in 1833 by Frederic Ozanam. It was a charitable work in harmony with his own, particularly that phase of it which found visible expression in the Hospice, in which he sheltered so many

orphaned and destitute stray waifs. On July 1, 1850, he inaugurated the Society of Mutual Help, the genesis of those innumerable societies or Union of Catholic Works which then flourished in Italy. The main object was to counteract the various associations inspired by Freemasonry, which under the guise of charity and philanthropy, tended to sap or undermine the faith of the people and withdraw them from the influence of the Church. One day two elegantly dressed gentlemen approached Giuseppe Brosio, of the Society of Mutual Help, and offered him about 600 lire, and promised to secure him an important position, if he would give up the Oratory and draw away his companions, but he indignantly refused, saying: "Don Bosco is my father and I would not abandon or betray him for all the gold in the world!" At intervals they renewed the offer, which was always rejected.

In 1851 was completed the first decade of the foundation of the work of the Oratories when, as they carried the founder on their shoulders in triumph, a young student exclaimed: "O Don Bosco, if one could see every part of the world and in each of them so many Oratories!" He answered: "Who knows if a day will not come when the sons of the Oratory will be scattered over the whole world!" He was already preparing to bring about that consummation. On February 2 his four first clerics were habited when, auspiciously, they kept the feast of St. Francis de Sales, under whose patronage the work had been placed. On the 19th of that month another important step forward was taken, when he agreed to purchase the Pinardi house for 30,000 lire without a penny in his pocket! Rosmini came to his aid by lending him 20,000 lire, the Countess Casazza-Riccardi gave 10,000 lire and Giuseppe Cotta, a banker, added 3,500 lire to cover incidental expenses. In a materialistic and commercial age, in which the science of economics and monopolies with the accumulation of millions ranked first; in the midst of so many speculators, egoists, indifferentists and proud contemners of Divine Providence, God, observes Father Lemoyne, raised up a man who, without capital and unknown in the spheres of commerce, was to carry on his works to colossal proportions, handling huge sums offered through charity and entirely spent for the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

The acquisition of the Pinardi house was only the prelude to bigger enterprises. A month afterwards he said to his mother: "Now I wish that we should erect a handsome church in honor of St. Francis de Sales." "But where will you get the money?" she asked. "You know we have none of our own; everything was spent to provide food and clothing for these poor boys; so, before undertaking the expenses of a church, you ought to think twice, and take counsel

with the Lord." "That's exactly what we shall do. If you had the money, would you not give it to me?" "You may imagine with what pleasure." "Now," concluded her son, "God who is so good, is more generous than you. He has funds all over the world, and for a work that should tend to His glory, I hope He will send me wherewithal in time and place."

He got an architect to draw a design and put the contract into the hands of Federico Bocca, warning him that sometimes he might not have the money to pay him. "Then we shall proceed more slowly with the work," said the cautious contractor. "Oh, no!" he replied, "I want you to get on with it as quickly as possible, and to have the church built within a year." "Very well," said Bocca, "we shall hurry matters on." "Then begin," said Don Bosco. "Here is some money already to go on with; Divine Providence will send us the rest in time." The Bishops, one of whom thanked the Lord "for having in such perverse times raised up in him a priest full of His Spirit and of holy zeal for the salvation of souls," wrote him encouraging letters; the King, who contributed 11,000 lire, laid the first stone; when the funds in hand were exhausted he raised more by that time-honored expedient on such occasions—a lottery, organized by a mixed committee which had the enthusiastic concurrence of all classes from royalty downwards. An earthquake that occurred at this time and did great damage throughout the city failed to shake the walls of the new edifice, which was regarded as a special favor from heaven. A very pious boy of thirteen, Gabriel Fassio, one of the *ricoverati* or rescued waifs sheltered in the Hospice, whose death Don Bosco predicted, after he had received the last sacraments, being *in extremis* about a year before that, foretold this disaster, repeating: "Woe to Turin! woe to Turin!" Some of his companions asked: "Why woe?" "Because," he said, "it is threatened with a great disaster." "What?" "A horrible earthquake." "When will it be?" "Another year. Oh, woe to Turin on the 26th of April!" "What should we do?" "Pray to St. Louis that he may protect the Oratory and those who inhabit it." Shortly after he died holily in the Cottolengo Hospital. Witnessing his rare virtues and struck by the apparently inspired tone in which he uttered the word "woe!" the boys were profoundly impressed and respected his advice. It was for this reason, at their request, were added to the prayers said in common morning and night, a *Pater*, *Ave* and *Gloria* to St. Louis with the invocation: *Ab omni malo libera nos, Domine*, a custom always observed in Salesian houses. Out of gratitude for the providential preservation of the Church, Don Bosco allocated half of the proceeds of the lottery to the Cottolengo Hospital. The first conference of Salesian coöperators, who were to be the chief lay promoters of his numerous works,

took place on the day of the inauguration of the sacred edifice, for which he wrote an ode, set to music and sung by the boys.

The same unbounded confidence in Divine Providence, the same unfaltering faith, the same splendid audacity, to use a phrase in which a panegyrist extolled an English Bishop,³ characterized the erection of the magnificent church of Our Lady Help of Christians in Turin, his *magnum opus* as a church-builder. Although very ill in Holy Week, 1863, and ordered by the physicians to remain in his room to take some needful rest, he would not do so, but kept revolving in his mind the erection of a large church in honor of her who, in repeated visions, had foreshown to him churches and houses in large numbers. He said to the cleric Paul Albera (now Don Albera, superior-general of the Salesian Congregation): "To-day I have been hearing confessions for a long time, but I hardly know what I said or did, for there was one idea which distracted me so powerfully as to take me almost out of myself. I kept on thinking over the small size of our church and how the boys are almost on top of each other. We shall build another handsomer, larger, magnificent, and will give it the title, Church of 'Most Holy Mary Help of Christians.' I haven't a halfpenny, nor do I know where to get the money; but that does not matter; if God wills it, it shall be done. I shall make the attempt, and if it fails, the shame will be wholly mine. They may then say: *coepit aedificare et non potuit consummare.*" When he again broached the subject, some one said to him: "To build a church without any means in an age so covetous and so self-interested! That would be tempting Providence." To this counsel of human prudence he replied: "When we are about to do anything, we should consider first if it is for the greater glory of God; if it is known to be so, let us go ahead and not hesitate, and success will follow." To Don Cagliero he said: "The present times are so sad that we have special need that the Blessed Virgin should help us to preserve and defend the faith. Do you know another reason?" Don Cagliero answered: "I believe it will be the mother church of your future society and the centre from whence will emanate our other works in favor of youth." "You have divined it," emphasized Don Bosco. "Most Holy Mary is the foundress and will be the supporter of our works!" Asked where it would be built, he indicated the site in a field opposite that of St. Francis de Sales' and with a gesture which signified its large proportions; it was the very spot where had taken place the martyrdom of SS. Salutorius, Adventorius and Octavius, of the Theban Legion. Although he had not yet acquired this site, he was enabled to do so on February 11, 1863, when he at once sent for the distinguished architect, Antonio Spezia, whom he

³ Dr. Butt, Bishop of Southwark.

commissioned to draw out designs for a church of vast dimensions. When this was done he sent the plan with the title, "Church of Our Lady Help of Christians," to the municipal authorities for their sanction, but, though they at first demurred to the title as "unpopular, inopportune and savoring of bigotry," by an adroit manœuvre he overcame the objection and had his way. He would not on any account change the title, for Pius IX. had sent him a first donation of 500 francs, which inspired the hope that such a title would be pleasing to the Queen of Heaven. Our Lady was not slow to show that the hope was well founded. An initial expenditure of 4,000 lire was involved in the purchase of the field, which exhausted the exchequer of the Oratory. The economer demurred. "What shall we do?" he asked aghast. "This morning there was not in the house wherewith to pay the postage on a letter." "Begin to dig the foundations," said Don Bosco. "When did we ever begin anything with the money ready beforehand? We must leave something to Providence."

Called to the bedside of a man who was seriously ill, he counseled him to make a novena to Our Lady for his cure, which was granted, and the grateful recipient of this favor gave him a promised gift of 1,000 francs for the church, just the sum he then needed to pay the workmen who were preparing the site. After that, money poured in from all parts of the world to the extent of over £40,000, almost all of it in thanksgiving for favors obtained through the intercession of Our Lady Help of Christians. The corner-stone was laid on April 27, 1865, by Prince Amadeus of Savoy, and the church was consecrated in 1868; the second of the churches the founder erected, models of very many since built by the Salesians. The first Mass was celebrated by the Archbishop of Turin at the high altar, Don Bosco immediately saying a Mass of thanksgiving to Our Lady. On his return to the sacristy he was surrounded by a multitude representative of every class, who congratulated him on the completion of this great undertaking. The sick were brought to him to be healed; devout people came to kiss his hands, the curious to see a man so much talked of, who did wonderful things. A man who had been blind for years had his sight restored and a paralytic recovered the use of his arm; preludes to many marvels wrought by Mary Help of Christians through the intermediary of her fervent and faithful disciple. It was an event of more than local interest; it was of national importance; and during the solemnities that signalized the octave crowds came from a distance, from Milan, Venice, Bologna, Florence, Rome and Naples to this new sanctuary of Our Lady Auxilium Christianorum.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Dublin, Ireland.

(To be concluded.)

FOUR FAMOUS SONS OF CERES.

"Here the heavy oats in a tangle spread;
And, ripening, closely neighbored by
Fields of barley and pale white rye,
The yellow wheat grows strong and high."

—Phæbe Cary ("Dovecote Mill")

SO LARGELY is our wealth and well-being a matter of oats, barley, rye and wheat, that if we were a more imaginative people, we might revive, in an innocent form, the ancient festivals held by the Greeks and Romans at harvest time in honor of the goddess of grain, variously known as Ceres, Rhea, Hera, Demeter, Cybelle, Tellus, Isis, Magna Mater, Great Mother, Earth Mother. In fact, all primitive peoples have had their lore of grain, which in the north was under the protection of Hulda, or Bertha, benevolent earth mother, who in her anxiety that the fields should have a plentiful crop of seed, protected them against damaging visitors by stationing were-wolves at the boundaries. Loki, the mischievous fire god, would sometimes steal past the wolves and sow his wild oats; and so, when heat simmers over his farm, the Jutlander says, "Loki is sowing his wild oats," from whence originated one of our most popular phrases.

Indeed, many primitive ideas and harvest customs can be traced to the ancient prevalence of a belief in Corn-Spirits, which haunted and protected the green or yellow fields. They were often pictured in human form, representative of the vegetative energy of growing grain, with which it flourishes and dies. But popular fancy also symbolized them as wolves or "buckmen"—goat-legged creatures similar to the classic Satyrs. Field-spirits figure largely at the present day in the superstitions of the Russian peasantry. In Iceland, the farmer guards the grass around his field, lest the elves abiding in it invade his crops. When the wind blows the long grass or waving grain, German peasants still say "the Grass-wolf," or "the Corn-wolf" is abroad. In many places the last sheaf of rye is left in the field as a shelter for the *Roggenwolf*, or "Rye-wolf," during the winter's cold, and in many a summer or autumn festive rite that being is represented by a rustic who assumes a wolf-like disguise; it is also believed that by leaving this last sheaf for the "Rye-wolves" to quarrel over assures the harvester sufficient time to hurry the rest of his crop into the barn and out of danger from those malignant spirits, who protect the grain so formidably that children are warned not to go into a field where it is growing, for fear the "Wehr-wolf" should seize them.

In the word "cereal," we have a record of the relation of Ceres to the grain. Ears of grain were her emblem, such as barley or bearded wheat, and her statues were commonly adorned with garlands of grain, with corn poppies added on account of these flowers being so frequently found in the fields:

"Sleep-bringing poppy, by the plowmen late,
Not without cause, to Ceres consecrate."

The harvest month, September, was represented by a maiden holding ears of grain. Bertha, being the Ceres of Norse mythology, was supposed to arrange all winds and clouds affecting the crops, and in some places she was supposed to come forth from nearby rocky haunts during harvest, particularly if the farmer be behind time, and cut and bind the grain with astonishing celerity. Quite appropriately many coins, ancient and modern, are ornamented with wreaths of grain; it was Egypt's wealth, and in many tongues is found the parable of the man who bade his son search diligently, for there was buried treasure in his field; the son plowed and dug for years, and discovered no buried coin, but his plowing resulted in splendid crops, from which he earned much money; and when he had become rich, and had earned the right to rest, he understood at last that the treasure was the earth's fatness, and that in increasing its yield of yellow grain he had lived more happily and usefully than if he had uncovered gold. Perhaps Francis, Duke of Bretagne, had read this parable, for in 1450 he instituted the Order of the Ears of Corn, with a golden collar made in this form, "to signify that Princes should be careful to preserve husbandry."

The grains have always played a prominent part in religious rites, particularly those relating to marriage. The time-honored practice of showering grain over a newly married couple is without doubt a survival of the Roman custom of making such offerings to the bride. In India, the bride is crowned with grain as a symbol of fertility. An old Polish custom consisted of the visitors throwing wheat, rye, oats, barley, rice and beans at the door of the bride's house, a symbol that she would never want any of these grains so long as she did her duty. In England, wheat was of old the chosen grain; Brand in his "Popular Antiquities" quotes more than one authority for the custom of sprinkling wheat upon the head of the bride, to which Herrick, in "A Nuptial Song," refers:

"While some repeat
Your praise, and bless you, sprinkling you with wheat."

When Henry VII. brought his bride to Bristol on the se'nnight following Whitsunday, 1486, a baker's wife cast out of a window a great quantity of wheat, crying "Welcome! and good luck!" In the

time of Henry VIII., a bride usually wore a garland of corn-ears; sometimes these wreaths were made of ears of wheat finely gilded if the family's finances would permit.

“locks that love no cornet like
Their native field-buds and the green wheat-spike.”
—Browning (“Sordello”)

In “Frithiof’s Saga” we read that “Frey round the Chieftain’s crown plaiteth corn-ears. Frigga binds bright-hued blue flow’rs among.” In this same *Saga*, there occurs a curious old design intended to represent the seasons figuratively, and May is indicated by an ear of grain, this being the time when the winter-rye begins to shoot into ear.

The weather-lore of cereals is far-reaching. For instance, it is a popular notion among European peasantry that if a drop of rain hang on an oat at the midsummer season, there will be a good crop. Another agricultural adage says, “No tempest, good July, lest corn come off bluely.” According to another saying, “The broom having plenty of blossoms is a sign of a fruitful year of corn.” Another is “When the bramble blooms early in June an early harvest may be expected.” The weather of certain seasons of the year is supposed to influence the vegetable world mightily, and in Rutlandshire they say that “a green Christmas brings a heavy harvest,” but a full moon about Christmas is unlucky, hence the adage:

“Light Christmas, light wheatsheaf,
Dark Christmas, heavy wheatsheaf.”

If the weather be clear on Candlemas Day “corn and fruits will then be dear,” and “whoever doth plant or sow on Shrove Tuesday, it will always be green.” Rain on Easter Day foretells a good harvest, but a poor hay crop, while thunder on All Fools’ Day “brings good crops of corn and hay,” while an old proverb reminds us that

“March dry, good rye;
April wet, good wheat.”

Husbandmen have long been accustomed to arrange their farming schedule from the indications given them by certain trees and plants:

“When the sloe tree is as white as a sheet,
Sow your barley whether it be dry or wet.”

“When the oak puts on his goslings gray,
'Tis time to sow barley night or day.”

“When the elmen leaf is as big as a mouse’s ear,
Then to sow barley never fear.
When the elmen leaf is as big as an ox’s eye,
Then say I, ‘Hie, boys, hie!’”

In bygone times, the appearance of the berries on the elder was held to indicate the proper season for sowing winter wheat :

“With purple fruit when elder branches bend,
And their high hues the hips and cornels lend,
Ere yet chill hoar-frost comes, or sleety rain,
Sow with choice wheat the neatly furrowed plain.”

Another old rule bids the farmer

“Upon St. David’s Day
Put oats and barley in the clay.”

In connection with the inclement weather that often prevails throughout the spring months it is commonly said, “They that go to their corn in May may come weeping away,” but “They that go in June come back with a merry tune.” Also, “He that sows oats in May gets little that way,” since, as they say in Corsica, “A rainy May brings little barley and no wheat.” A further admonition advises the farmer to “Sow wheat in dirt, and rye in dust,” while according to a piece of folklore current in East Anglia, “Wheat well sown is half grown,” leaving the manner of the sowing to the knowledge and experience of the sower. But the Scotch have a proverb warning the farmer against premature sowing :

“Nae hurry wi’ your corns,
Nae hurry wi’ your harrows;
Snaw lies ahint the dyke,
Mair may come and fill the furrows.”

while

“Calm weather in June
Sets corn in tune.”

As the cuckoo returns to England at certain well regulated times, it has been customary to predict, from his appearance, what kind of season will follow :

“Well, here’s the cuckoo come again, after the barley sowing.”
—Robert Buchanan (“An English Eclogue—Timothy”)

Hesiod tells us that “if it should happen to rain three days together, when the cuckoo sings among the oak trees, then late sowing will be good as early sowing. Even in Egypt the cuckoo’s return was taken to be the correct time for wheat and barley harvesting. In Berwickshire those oats which are sown after the first of April are called “Gowk’s Oats,” or “Cuckoo’s Oats”; so that if March weather admits of the farm work being got forward it is remarked that “there will be no Gowk Oats this year.” The following proverb is much quoted in some places :

“Cuckoo Oats and Woodcock Hay
Make a farmer run away,”

by which we understand that if the spring is backward and oats cannot be sown until the cuckoo is heard, or the autumn so wet that the hay cannot be gathered in till the woodchucks come over, the farmer is sure to suffer great loss.

Aside from the common proverb, "He hath sown his wild oats," there are others in which the European "corn" appears. For instance, the inclination of evil to override good is embodied in "The weeds overgrow the corn." Those who contrive to get a good return for their meagre work or money are said to "have made a long harvest for a little corn"; those who reap advantage from another man's labor "put their sickle into another man's corn"; while in spite of the disagreeable features of fame and power "the king's chaff is better than other people's corn." And things that are slow but sure in their progress are the subject of a well-known Gloucestershire saying, "It is as long in coming as Cotswold barley," which is explained thus: "The corn in this cold country exposed to the winds, bleak and shelterless, is very backward at first, but afterward overtakes the forwardest in the country, if not in the barn, in the bushel, both for the quantity and goodness thereof." According to the Italians, "every grain hath its bran," implying that nothing is without certain imperfections.

In dreams, plucking ears of corn signifies the existence of secret enemies. But "If ye cannot slepe, but slumber, geve Otes unto Saint Uncumber." In Scotland, the knots from the stalks of wheat, oats, or barley may be used to cure warts, as follows: "Find a straw with *nine knoes*, and cut the knots that form the joints of every one of them. If there are any more knots throw them away. Then bury the nine knots in a midden or dung-heap; as the joints rot so will the warts." The reason for choosing these knots is probably due to the Roman god Nodinus, who presided over the *nodi* or knots of the grain stalks, on which account they may possibly have been accounted sacred. Perhaps this is why, in the neighborhood of Oldenburg, it is said that cornstalks should be strewn about the house in which a corpse is lying, to prevent further misfortune to the family.

So much for the folklore of these four cereals, which, by the way, are all proud to wear their good old Anglo-Saxon names. Their history is a long one, and their use by the poets frequent.

Barley is more widely distributed and more generally used than any other one of the four brothers, and from the most remote times an important article of the food of man. Pliny speaks of it as the first grain cultivated for nourishment. As it can be raised under widely varying climatic conditions, it is found where other grains are not available. Where it originated is not known, but the plant

grows wild in Sicily and the interior of Asia, and it is generally believed that *Hordeum vulgare*, or commonly cultivated barley, is but a form of this wild species, *Hordeum spontaneum*. *Hordeum* is the Latin word for the grain; *barley* is from the Anglo-Saxon *bere*, traceable through the Icelandic and Gothic names to the Latin *far*, or spelt. Originally applied to barley of any variety, *bere*, according to the Oxford Encyclopædic Dictionary, now "includes the six-rowed and four-rowed kinds; *bigg* the four-rowed only. But *bere* interchanges in local use, now with barley, now with *bigg*."

Hordeum vulgare has appealed to the poet. To him it is "tufted barley yellow with the sun," he observes, "on tilted barley-stalks the dewdrops' glint in webs of gossamer." He admires "the white-bearding bending barley-ears that nod in the soft south breeze," and even notices that "the barley's beard is rough, O"; and

"down to the moist
Dale's silken barley-spikes sullied with rain,
Swayed earthwards, heavily to rise again."

—Robert Browning ("Sordello")

"The yellow sea of a barley-field" when "the barley is glossy as silk, bowing to every cloud," and the "barley bows from the west before a delicate breeze," has caught the eye of the poet and caused him to note its beauty:

"There the barley, silvery green
Vests the vale with rippling sheen."
—Katherine Cooper ("The Drift—Lincolnshire")

"A plenteous place is Ireland for hospitable cheer,
Where the wholesome fruit is bursting from the yellow barley ear."
—From the Irish

"Staid amid the hanging barley,
Blue upon the golden barley."
—William Renton ("Corn-Bluebottles")

"The grain stands bonny where the cliffs are sheer,
And the blue North Sea is sleeping;
The stooks are yellow in a golden ear,
With their shadows onward creeping."
—Violet Jacob ("The Barley")

"The barley harvest was nodding white
When my children died on the rocky height,
And the reapers were singing on hill and plain
When I came to my task of sorrow and pain."
—Bryant ("Mizpah")

As for the grain itself, it is mentioned in the dramatic picture Browning gives in "The Pied Piper of Hamelin":

"Little hands clapping, and little tongues chattering,
And, like fowls in a farm-yard when barley is scattering,
Out came the children running."

There are about fifty known species of *Avena*, the genus of grasses, in which the oat is classed; *Avena sativa* is the one commonly cultivated. Its native country is in doubt, but probably it is Mesopotamia, where it was known before the Christian era. Because the climate of Scotland is peculiarly suited to the profitable raising of oats, which will flourish there when wheat and barley will not, it has become the national food of Scotland, as the potato is claimed by Ireland, though neither is indigenous to the country claiming them.

In the language of flowers, Oats means "The witching soul of music," and it is in motion that they have appealed to the poets; "the quivering oats rustle their waving pennons,"—"the taiper woats da bend ther heads"—"where waters shine there runs a whisper as of wind-swept oats"—and

"In fancy he sees his trembling oats uprun."

—Robert Bloomfield ("The Farmer's Boy")

"Two sister nymphs, the fair Avenas, lead
Their fleecy squadrons on the lawns of Tweed;
Pass with light step his wave-worn banks along,
And wake his echoes with their silver tongue."

—Erasmus Darwin ("The Loves of the Plants")

"This tapering shaft of oat, that knows
To grow erect as the great pine grows,
And to sway in the wind as well as he."

—Edward B. Sill ("Field Notes")

Strange to say, it is the wild oats (*Avena fatua*), which the farmer considers a pest, that has more often attracted the attention of the American poet; and it, too, usually is in motion: "rank wild oats waving in wild strength" (Joaquin Miller); "he saw the wild oats wrestle on the hill" (Bret Harte); "where the wild oats wrapped thy knees in gold, the ploughman drives his share" (Bayard Taylor); and

"Onward I ride in the blowing oats,
Checking the field-lark's rippling notes."

—C. E. Markham ("The Joy of the Hills")

"Thing of earth, yet seemingly of air!
A silvery wand, thy slim, seductive grace,
With which the winds their mystic symbols trace
Elusive sprites agleam, now dark, now fair,
Athwart the blue in sheen of fairy lace.
Coquette of wood and field! In thy embrace
Full many wiles the straying zephyrs dare."

—Mildred Tingle ("California Wild Oats")

"The wild oats swirl along the plain,
I feel their dash against my knees,
Like rapid splash of running seas."

—Hamlin Garland ("Prairie Memories")

"I'll lead you where the wild oat shines
And swift clouds dapple the wheat with rain."

—Hamlin Garland ("An Apology")

It is *Avena fatua*, or some other uncultivated member of the genus, which Loki sows among the good seed, and which in Jutland is called "Loki's hair, probably through confusion of *haver* or *hafra* (oats) with *haar* (hair). In that country they say of a careless scapegrace that "Loki is sowing his seed in him," rather than the English wording which makes the scapegrace himself the sower.

The Animated Oats, vulgarly known as "animal oats," or "the walking oats," is a curious form of *Avena* (it is the *A. sterilis* of the botanists). The seeds are enclosed in stiff, hairy husks, having each a long and remarkably gifted awn, which when dry is twisted closely upon itself, but when moistened with dew or rain slowly uncoils, causing the seeds to sprawl about upon the ground,—a sort of "touch-me-not" device—for self-sowing. When two of these become linked together, the shape of the seeds and their hairy glumes and their united awns take the form of an insect, and the motion, which is purely mechanical, seems to be of an animated and voluntary nature. This species is sometimes cultivated as a curiosity. Jugglers were wont in former times to predict events and tell fortunes by means of these seeds. Since the awns are very susceptible of change of temperature or moisture, the dry seeds were merely placed on a damp hand, or breathed upon, when they would commence to wriggle and move about. To cover the cheat, the magician called his magic plant the leg of an Arabian spider, or the leg of an enchanted fly, and many people were deceived into consulting the wonderful clairvoyant.

The origin of Rye is likewise involved in the greatest uncertainty. Distinct species of grain are now known to have been the subjects of cultivation where rye is mentioned by the ancient writers, especially those of the sacred Scriptures and of the east. It is also inferred that it was little used as an agricultural cereal in ancient Greece or Italy. According to Pliny, however, it was cultivated as a fodder and for grain by the Taurini, who occupied that part of Gaul now known as Piedmont. In Britain, as appears from ancient rents, rye was cultivated at an early period, and a practice long prevailed of sowing rye and wheat together, or even rye and barley.

"Here, the bright golden wheat-fields vie
With the rich tawny of the rye."

—A. B. Street ("The Freshet")

"The waves of wheat and rye
Higher and higher flood on every side
Where in the hedges lie
Like sunken reefs washed by a golden tide."
—Anon. ("After Summer")

"'Twas 'Little Jerry, come grind my rye,'
And, 'Little Jerry, come grind my wheat.'"
—J. G. Saxe ("Little Jerry, the Miller")

"On either side the river lie
Long fields of barley and of rye
That clothe the wold and meet the sky."
—Tennyson ("The Lady of Shalott")

From early April, when "the rye-fields show a tender hue of fresh'ning green amid the brown," to October, when "the stolid oaktree's smould'ring fire is sullen against emerald rye," a field of this grain is a joy and a delight. The "lakes of rye that wave and flow," whether it be "the dusky green of the rye as it ripples and shades in the breeze," or "the green-and-gold of summer on the rye," they never fail to please:

"I know it is August, for the fields of rye
No longer wave in shining, billowy ranks;
But have, like armies, pitched their tawny tents;
Beside the stream's low, shrunken banks."
—Belle A. Hitchcock ("August")

"When rye begins to bend its head
Fearing the coming reaper's tread
That ruthless o'er it soon shall pass."
—Lloyd Mifflin ("In the Fields")

"The summer grains were harvested; the stubble-fields lay dry
Where June winds rolled, in light and shade, the pale green waves
of rye."
—John G. Whittier ("The Huskers")

"I wished the drooping heads of rye
Set full of silver dews
Were silken tassels all to tie
The ribbons of his shoes."
—Alice Cary ("Tricksey's Ring")

"You must remember the long rippling ridge
Of rye, that cut the level land in two,
And changed from blue to green, from green to blue,
Summer after Summer."
—Alice Cary ("Damaris")

In "The Tempest," occurs a reference to another popular use for the grass:

"You sunburn'd sicklemen, of August weary,
Come hither from the furrow, and be merry,
Make holy-day your rye-straw hats put on."
—(Act. IV., Scene I.)

George Crabbe, in "The Village," notes that peculiar blight known as ergot to which the seeds of *Secale cereale* is subject:

"Rank weeds that every art and care defy,
Reign o'er the land, and rob the blighted rye."

And this is the grain which Longfellow names in his poem to Robert Burns:

"For him the ploughing of those fields
A more ethereal harvest yields
Than sheaves of grain;
Songs flush with purple bloom the rye,
The plover's call, the curlew's cry,
Sing in his brain."

The last of the four brothers is *Triticum sativa*, whose Latin name shows its great antiquity as a bread-making grain, since it comes from *tritum*, to grind,—which we know by the modernized form of its Anglo-Saxon name *hwæte*. The original country of the common wheat is unknown, and it no longer occurs in an uncultivated state, but its cultivation has been the employment of men from the remotest antiquity, being found connected with ancient history, both sacred and profane, and ever accompanying the human race in its most primitive or most advanced condition of civilization. It was an important food crop in ancient Egypt and in Palestine, also among the lake dwellers in Switzerland, where wheat grains are found in archæological remains.

Who, 'mid the grasses of the field
That spring beneath our careless feet,
First found the shining stems that yield
The grains of life-sustaining wheat,
Who first upon the furrowed land
Strewed the bright grains to sprout, and grow,
And ripen for the reaper's hand,—
We know not, and we cannot know."
—William Cullen Bryant ("Dante")

This grain, in the language of flowers, speaks of "riches," and is most fittingly assigned that symbol, whether considered in color,—
"the golden ears from the wheat harvest of Bacchylides"
(Meleager's Anthology), in its rich food value:

"Shot up from broad rank blades that droop below,
The nodding wheat-ear forms a graceful bow,
With milky kernels starting full, weight'd down,
Ere yet the sun hath ting'd its head with brown."
—Robert Bloomfield ("The Farmer's Boy")

or its wonderful yield; as: "where the wheat spreads far and wide, plenty laughs from side to side"; or

"Acres of gold wheat,
Astir in the sunshine,
Rounding the hill-top,
Crested with plenty
Filling the valley,
Brimmed with abundance;
Wind in the wheat-field,
Eddying and settling,
Swaying it, sweeping it,
Lifting the rich heads
Tossing them soothingly."

—Duncan Scott ("The Harvest")

That it came to America with the Pilgrims is indicated by these lines from "The Courtship of Miles Standish"; proving that the gentle art of camouflage was practiced even by these upright men:

"Yonder there, on the hill by the sea, lies buried Rose Standish;
Green above her is growing the field of wheat we have sown there
Better to hide from the Indian scouts the graves of our people
Lest they should count them and see how many already have
perished."

A wheat-field is one of the glories of the growing season, both as an object of beauty and for the promise it holds forth of food in abundance, regardless of the stage of its growth, from the time the "resurrection of the wheat appears with pale visage out of its graves," and "the yellow-speared wheat with every grain from its shroud in the dark-brown fields uprising," both Walt Whitman's description of its first appearance, through the summer until "steeped in yellow, still lie fields where wheat was reaped." This use of "steeped" occurs twice in poetical references to this grain, Bryant also applying it in

"The sun of May was bright in middle heaven,
And steeped the sprouting forests, the green hills,
And emerald wheat-fields, in his yellow light."

—("The Old Man's Counsel")

The rapid growth this grain makes after a favorable shower is implied in the lines "The emerald wheat leapt gaily to meet the welcome kiss of the rain." Its appearance in the early summer is described as

"Blue-necked the wheat sways, yellowing to the sheaf,"

—George Meredith ("Love in the Valley")

"Soft amid the crisping wheat,
Blue upon the silver wheat."

—William Renton ("Corn-Bluebottles")

"And on the wide-stretched fields the sea-green corn
Stands motionless—no jointed stem vibrates
No bloom-tipped head, unfilled, aslant is borne,
No pendant blade a breath now agitates";

—R. Cooper ("The Wheat in Blossom")

In motion, these fields are sketched in such vivid word-pictures
as:

"I note the fingers of the lazy breeze
Play symphonies upon the languid ferns,
And on the bearded wheat wake mimic seas."

—Richard K. Munkittrick ("In Midsummer")

"And bright, where summer breezes break,
The green wheat crinkles like a lake."

—John T. Trowbridge ("Midsummer")

"And the waving wheat-fields seemed to me
The gleaming waves of a summer sea."

—G. B. Wallace ("May-Day at Manassas, 1861")

"Like liquid gold the wheat field lies,
A marvel of yellow and green
That ripples and runs, that floats and flies."

—Hamlin Garland ("Color in the Wheat")

"A glittering host with fringed spears of gold
All slowly swaying as the breezes rolled
Above the poppies in the ripened wheat."

—Lloyd Mifflin ("The Fields of Dawn")

"wheat-fields rolled
Beneath the warm wind waves of green and gold";

—Whittier ("The Pennsylvania Pilgrim")

"A tropic tide of air with ebb and flow
Bathes all the fields of wheat until they glow
Like flashing seas of green."

—Helen Hunt Jackson ("Poppies on the Wheat")

"When summer's hourly-mellowing change
May breathe, with many roses sweet,
Upon the thousand waves of wheat,
That ripple round the lonely grange."

—Tennyson ("In Memoriam")

And the sound of these waves is also described: "The swash of the
wheat runs high," says Hamlin Garland in "Moods of the Plain,"
and others have made such musical comparisons as:

"Oft have I seen thee, in some sensuous air,
Bewitch the broad wheat-acres everywhere
To imitate the gold of thy deep hair."

—Madison Cawein ("Music of Summer")

"You ask me for the sweetest sound mine ears have ever heard?
 A sweeter than the ripples' plash, or trilling of a bird;
 Than tapping of the raindrops upon the roof at night,
 Than the sighing of the pine trees on yonder mountain height?
 And I tell you, these are tender, yet never quite so sweet
 As the murmur and the cadence of the wind across the wheat."

—Margaret E. Sangster ("The Wind Across the Wheat")

When about ready for the harvest, "broad on either hand the golden wheat-fields glimmer in the sun" (Whittier) and

"But I look down upon the groun'
 O' wheat a turnen yoller."

—William Barnes ("Carn a-Turnen Yoller")

"The pale tints of the twilight fields
 Have turned into burnished gold,
 For waves of yellow light have rolled
 From the open'd east across the wealds,
 While 'mid the wheat spires far behind
 Stirs lazily the awaken'd wind."

—William Sharp ("Sunrise Above the Broad Wheatfields")

To two poets, the color of gold takes on a deeper tinge, for Owen Meredith says that "each year the red wheat gleams near the river-banks," and Edwin Arnold tells us that "the red wheat rustles, and the vines are purple to the root." Walt Whitman, in "A Carol of Harvest," names three of the wheat growing States when he commands "Harvest the wheat of Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin,"—but he by no means names the chief wheat-growing States, since he omits the Dakotas, Kansas and Nebraska. Alice Cary makes the following apt comparison:

"The wheat stocks stood
 Along the fields like little fairy men."

—("The Shadow")

In a didactic sense, this grain has appealed to the following:

"He that
 will have a cake out of the wheat must tarry the grinding."

—"Troilus and Cressida" (Act I., Scene I.)

"But now the wheat is green and high
 On clods that hid the warrior's breast."

—Bryant

while Phœbe Cary has incorporated in verse the practice among Scandinavian peasants of placing a sheaf of wheat on a pole in front of the house to provide the birds with a Christmas treat:

“‘And bid the children fetch,’ he said,
‘The last ripe sheaf of wheat,
And set it on the roof overhead,
That the birds may come and eat.’”
—Phœbe Cary (“The Christmas Sheaf”)

And it is to these four brothers, with the help of their youngest and New World brother, *Zea mays*, that the world now looks with anxious care, for never perhaps in the history of civilization were they more needed in bountiful supplies than this present crop season.

HARRIETTE WILBUR.

Duluth, Minn.

EVANGELINE IN A NEW LIGHT.

THE delicate figure of Longfellow's "Evangeline"—so remote from modern ideals—is tragically set in the poem. Into its sombre atmosphere, indeed, she fades and blends, standing out with only enough of actuality to deepen the gloom, much as a silver birch, scarcely observed, makes visible the ashen evening. For the tragedy of "Evangeline" is the tragedy of a whole community. The dark-eyed girl herself, "Benedict Bellefontaine, the wealthiest farmer of Grand-Pré," Gabriel Lajeunesse, all seem to us but slightly drawn. The true protagonist of the drama is the village—with its sweet Norman homesteads set among the flowering orchards and pastures for black cattle—Grand-Pré itself. It is the village that suffers red ruin, the wailing ghost of the village that is driven like smoke from the familiar shore. The story has been told often enough, but, I think, not truly, because material was lacking, if not for a history of events, at least for a satisfactory estimate of their causes and results. The present writer, having been led to make some study of the subject, believes that there is room for an amended account of "Evangeline."

Longfellow's version is well known. A pastoral people, the French settlers in Acadia, are suddenly and harshly summoned to come together and hear the King's pleasure. That King is George II., a remote, to them unknown, King. The anxious people gather in the church, and when its doors have been made fast, the King's officer reads a proclamation declaring that, since they have ill repaid His Majesty's clemency, their lands and goods are all confiscate to the Crown, and they themselves sentenced to deportation. There follow the terrible scenes of forced embarkation, the despair of the people—anger of men, fruitless weeping of women—the last night in Acadia is lit by the intolerable flames that pierce and crumble their dwellings. With the dawn the ships launch out into the deep, and the exiles are borne seaward, to be scattered hereafter like chaff, on all the shores of America.

"Friendless, homeless, helpless, they wandered from city to city,
From the cold lakes of the north to sultry southern savannas,
From the bleak shores of the sea to the land where the Father of
Waters

Seizes the hills in his hands and drags them down to the ocean."

—("Evangeline," Pt. II.)

Now the only explanation suggested by the poet for this vengeance of the English Crown on the farmers and peasants of Acadia is

inadequate, and, I am convinced, untrue. He hints that these French settlers had joined the French of Canada in arms against the English:

"Louisberg is not forgotten, nor Beau Séjour, nor Port Royal."

—("Evan.," Pt. I.)

But, whatever may have been the conduct of individuals, the Acadians as a whole had shown a singular steadiness in maintaining themselves as the "French Neutrals." They would take up arms, neither for King George, nor yet against him. Nevertheless, in the autumn and winter of 1755, some 9,000 of them were deported, and their farms were given to English colonists. How did this come about?

The most recent material on the subject is to be found in the fine "History of the Society of Jesus in North America" (Vol. II., 1917), by the Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J., whose scholarly researches in the archives of Europe have made clear so much that was formerly unknown or obscure. Père Rochemonteix, "*Histoire des Jésuites de la Nouvelle France au 18me Siècle*," gives a spirited account of many of the events we are concerned with, and the article "Acadia," in the Catholic Encyclopedia, based on the histories of Murdoch, Richard, Haliburton, etc., is of course valuable. Bancroft's history and Shea's, as well as Akin's volume of selections from the public documents of Nova Scotia, have also been used by the present writer.

Acadia, a beautiful and fruitful country, had a checkered history from the beginning of the seventeenth century till near the end of the eighteenth. Henry IV. of France, in the easy fashion of kings, gave leave in 1603 to the Seigneur de Monts to colonize "La Cadie, Canada, and other places in New France from 40 to 46 degrees north." Unfortunately, however, James I. of England, in 1606, when giving leave to a London and Plymouth Company lands from 35 to 45 degrees north, omitted to explain how they were to deal with the pre-existing French claim. Hence a long conflict for the possession of Acadia. By treaty and by conquest, it passed three times to France, and three times to England before 1713, when the famous treaty of Utrecht ceded—this time finally to England—the entire Province of Nova Scotia. Père Rochemonteix (Vol. II., 113) gives a highly colored account of the position he conceives to have been created in Acadia, pouring out his wrath upon the English, "a treacherous and brutal race," and giving ardent sympathy to the simple, honest, unlettered peasants, now subject to them. Perhaps it is excessive to identify politicians and adventurers with the race to which they happen to belong, but it is true that the new situation in the Province can be understood only by some study of the conflicting personalities who came at this time to stand to each other in so close a relationship.

The Acadians were, without doubt, a faithful Catholic people. "What you seem to think most precious—your religion," was a phrase used to them by one of their Governors. They had an ineradicable respect for "Roamish Priests." "A people who will neither believe nor harken to reason unless it comes out of the mouths of their priests," wrote Governor Phillips. The Board of Trade fears that "while their priests retain so great an influence over them, they will never become good subjects of His Majesty." The good French blood ran strongly in their veins, so that they loved the language and usages of their ancestors. Living as they did, in great simplicity, it was always the parish priest who made their records, settled their successions, and, when disputes arose, administered a primitive kind of justice. Besides being farmers, they were hunters and fishermen, trappers, too, with all the woodcraft of Indians. "We are well aware of your industry and your temperance," wrote Governor Cornwallis,¹ "and that you are not addicted to any kind of vice or debauchery." But they had, of course, the astuteness, the grasping self-interest of the genuine peasant. In a sense, no one less "simple" than a peasant can be imagined. The treaty of Utrecht, then, put this people into the power of the first Hanoverian King. It would be idle to suppose that either the first or the second George concerned himself, personally, with such things as colonies and plantations; it fell to ministers—Newcastle, Bedford, the Lords of Trade, to colonial governors and colonial adventurers, to control the fate of French and Catholic Acadia. Of what temper were these men? They were men of the eighteenth century, and especially of that Orange Revolution which affected England so profoundly, whose effects have scarcely ceased, even to-day. But the Orange Revolution was, itself, an anti-Catholic movement. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries treated the Catholic faith with hot hostility and violence, but with the eighteenth century, as has been so well said:

A new era began in Catholic life, political, civil and domestic. The new legislation penetrated everywhere—it was like a slow file—wearing away the power of resistance, and evoking no spirit of heroism.²

One law in particular, that of the Session of 1698-99 . . . was treated during the following century as a kind of Imperial Magna Charta against Catholicism. It was entitled "An act for the further preventing the growth of Popery."³

This act provided that any person apprehending or prosecuting unto conviction a Bishop, priest or Jesuit, should receive the sum of £100. The statutory crime was saying Mass or exercising any priestly

¹ N. S. R., 189.

² Hughes: Vol. II., p. 162.

³ Hughes: Vol. II., p. 162.

function. Further, any Catholic coming to the age of eighteen must, within six months, acknowledge the King as supreme ecclesiastical authority, and in other ways blaspheme Catholic doctrine, or else be incapable of inheriting goods, honors, or titles. During such person's life, his next of kin, being a Protestant, should hold his lands; but the Catholic could obtain possession of them, at any time, by "conforming." No Catholic could purchase or acquire lands, domains or hereditaments. No Catholic might send his son abroad for Catholic education, but any child of Catholic parents, declaring himself a Protestant, was to be assigned a maintenance out of his parents' estate.

"The general status of Catholics was, that, ecclesiastically they were excommunicated, civilly they were interdicted, to some effects of law they were dead." Worst of all, perhaps, "While at every turn in the history of Catholics we run against a law, there was, outside the circuit of law, the pressure of a ubiquitous spirit, which, after inspiring the legislation, breathed freely in the atmosphere, above the letter of statutes, and independently of enactments. This spirit was like a new kind of chancery, the equity of which was the consciousness of anti-Popery in a man's bosom, in much the same way as all jurisprudence was conceived to lie in the King's bosom, *in scrinio pectoris sui*, so that he could do no wrong."⁴

Under George I. an act was passed extending "recusancy," a crime only committed hitherto by those who refused to attend the Protestant church, to those who refused Protestant oaths. The act concerned office-holders, civil and religious, educational, military and naval. Any two justices at their pleasure might tender the oaths of allegiance, abhorrency and abjuration (by the latter a man accepted the royal supremacy, and declared against Pope and Pretender) to any suspected persons, who on refusal of them became Popish recusants convict, with all the penalties attached to that position. Truly, if our "excellent and indispensable eighteenth century," as Matthew Arnold called it, laid aside the axe and the rope it was because it felt them to be no longer needed. The "slow file" of a minute and cruel legislation would do the work of extermination even better. And it was men of a temper formed by these laws who came, in 1713, to be rulers of a Catholic people who seemed to think their religion "most precious." The situation held the dark seed of tragedy.

Undoubtedly, the first thought of the Acadian French was to emigrate to the colonies of "Notre Bon Roi de France," and live under his protection. The treaty of Utrecht expressly secured their right to do this. Queen Anne wrote in the same sense to General

⁴ Hughes: Vol. II., p. 172.

Nicholson, adding that, should they wish, instead of emigrating, to become her subjects, they were to remain on their lands without any molestation. But the Governor wished nothing less than to see the French settlers quit the Province. He had no mind to rule over a land still and depopulated, swept of its flocks and herds, the impenetrable forest creeping over its fields; nor did he desire to see the French colonies strengthened with numbers of valuable settlers. He feared the Indians, who were on terms of excellent friendship with the Acadians, but were more or less hostile to the English. Therefore he opposed strenuously the proposed emigration, would have no English vessels employed for the purpose, and even went so far as to seize the settlers' boats, which they were preparing for the voyage.⁵ Perforce they stayed, but they would take no oath of absolute allegiance to King George; they swore only to be faithful to the English Crown so long as they should be in Nova Scotia. Their French blood, their faith, forbade more.

The treaty of Utrecht had stipulated that Acadia should enjoy the free exercise of the Catholic religion, as far as the laws of Great Britain allowed, a concession which, considering the Act of 1698, does not seem an extensive privilege. No wonder that—as Governor Phillips wrote to Secretary Craggs—the people feared to be “reduced to the state of His Majesty’s Popish subjects in Ireland, their priests denied them.” “I endeavor all I can to undeceive them,” he added. In fact, although the penal laws did not apply to Acadia, there ensued a state of things which could by no means be described as the “free exercise” of religion, but was rather the State supervision of a State Church. The Government wished to suppress the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Quebec, so that his “insolent priests who come and go at pleasure” should, in future, come and go, be appointed to parishes and dismissed from them, only as the reigning Governor should ordain. No new churches could be built, or even old ones repaired, without the same secular approval.⁶ Priests had to be licensed by the civil authority, before they might “presume to officiate,” and even then, “No missionary priest shall possess himself of, or exercise, any part of his priestly function in any other parish than that for which he was petitioned, without the Governor’s permission first had and obtained.”⁷ This was the interpretation of the promise, so often made, regarding free exercise of religion.

Moreover, they were, at times, under military law. If their goods were needed for public service, “they were not to be bargained with for the payment,” says the Order in the Council Records at Halifax. They must comply “immediately,” or the next courier would bring

⁵ Rochemonteix: Vol. II., 115.

⁶ Rochemonteix, I., 120.

⁷ Nova Scotia Records, p. 125.

an order for military execution upon the delinquents. If fuel was to be gathered, "should they not do it in proper time, the soldiers shall absolutely take their houses for fuel."⁸ Meanwhile, the oath of allegiance was being pressed upon them.

About 1720, began that duel on the subject of the oath, between the Governors of Nova Scotia and their subjects, which makes amusing reading even to-day. So well do the "simple peasants" know what they are about, so skilfully do they argue with the Governors, that we are inclined to agree with Governor Phillips as to the "Jesuitical frame" of the letters betraying a "priest's composure." Briefly, the Acadians would not swear allegiance to the English Crown, unless a clause were added to the oath, exempting them from bearing arms against either the French of Canada or their "Indian brothers." On this point they were adamant. Matters dragged on till 1726. In September of that year, Armstrong, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, held a council to meet the Acadian deputies. He urged them to swear allegiance, promising them their lands in secure possession and the free practice of their faith. He pointed out to them that the exempting clause they asked for was unnecessary, since no Catholic was allowed to serve in His Majesty's army. Obstinate, they insisted on their point, and, in the end, the Governor, with the advice of his council, had the clause desired written on the document they were to sign. Whereupon, all the deputies swore.⁹ Later, in the winter of 1730, Governor Phillips induced the whole Province, *i. e.*, every man between sixteen and sixty years of age, to take the oath of allegiance to George II.; it being allowed, however, that this did not include bearing arms.

In the years that followed, the Acadians seem to have accepted, by degrees, their condition of British subjects. When, in 1744, the French from Isle Royal under Duvivier invaded the Province, they refused the aid he demanded. "We live under a mild and tranquil government," they somewhat pathetically told him, "and we all have reason to be faithful to it."¹⁰ The French invaders were driven out, and Mascarene, in a letter to the Acadian deputies, expresses his pleasure in learning "that the inhabitants in general have remained true to the allegiance which they owe to the King of Great Britain, notwithstanding the efforts made to cause them to disregard it."¹¹ Among other villages called upon for supplies, Grand-Pré, Evangeline's village, had been ordered to send "eight horses and two men to drive them," to Duvivier, but had refused.

The strange, eventful history of Acadia might seem to have

⁸ Bancroft, IV., 196-7.

⁹ N. S. R., 66-7.

¹⁰ N. S. R., 135.

¹¹ N. S. R., 137.

reached, now, the last scene of all. The French inhabitants had taken that oath which was to make safe to them the exercise of their religion, the possession of their lands, and all other privileges of British subjects; they had proved their loyalty to their sworn word. But any peace they enjoyed was but the ominous calm of slowly darkening skies; and, in fact, their minds were not, even now, at rest; they feared what their rulers might do. In 1746-47, however, General Shirley made and repeated in the King's name a Declaration that there was no intention of removing them from their lands. Copies of this document printed in French at Boston, were distributed among them. The Duke of Newcastle wrote to Shirley, promising, in His Majesty's name, "to protect and maintain all such of them as shall continue in their duty and allegiance to His Majesty in the quiet and peaceable possession of their respective habitations and settlements, and that they shall continue to enjoy the free exercise of their religion."¹² The King intended to send over a declaration to that effect, but the crisis of the moment made it seem better that Shirley himself should fix the precise terms. Shirley did so, but left out the clause as to free exercise of religion; and, since both Shirley and Mascarene assured the Duke of Bedford that the omission was of no moment, he benignly agreed with them. But Shirley knew well enough what he was about, and, while receiving deputations from the Acadians expressing their gratitude to the King for his Declaration, he was opening his soul to the Duke of Bedford in a series of remarkable letters.¹³ He had sent a surveyor, Captain Charles Morris, to report on the land in Acadia. It seemed that the Acadians had actually "possest themselves of all that was valuable" in their own country, and the proposal was that they should be removed from their improved farms—dyked and tilled in the sweat of their brows—to the dry uplands, so that the said farms might be bestowed upon Protestant settlers. It was reckoned that 1,420 Protestant families might be provided for in this way. Shirley proposed also to proselytize the rightful owners—on their dry uplands. They should be bribed to apostatize, induced to marry New England intruders, or what he described as the "next best settlers"—North of Ireland Protestants. Shirley's brain teemed with projects of marriage and apostasy. There were Protestants in Jersey and Guernsey who might be imported for the purpose, Protestants from the Swiss cantons, from the Palatinate, from Prussia even—the point was to have plenty of eligible Protestants.¹⁴ Letter followed letter to the Secretary of State. He proposed that the penal laws should be applied to Acadia, that Romish priests should be banished and Protestant missionaries

¹² H. II., 174.

¹³ H. II., 175-6.

¹⁴ H. II., 175.

introduced; he urged that all titles of the Acadians to their lands should be declared void, or that, failing this outrageous measure, any lands still allowed them should be held by the tenure of "Knight's service."¹⁵ The Assembly of Massachusetts became as eager as Shirley for land and souls, and even sent an address to George II., making suitable suggestions as to dealing with the Acadians.

In 1749, Cornwallis became Governor of Nova Scotia, and from that date until 1755, a fresh harassing of the Acadians on the subject of the oath began and was continued with increasing vigor. It was put to them plainly, that, either they must take the oath without any exemption as to bearing arms, or they must quit the country. But if they did leave the country it would be as beggars, since their whole possessions would be confiscated.¹⁶ Now, we may very fairly ask why this people should have been harassed at all. They had sworn allegiance to King George in 1730, and had been faithful to their engagements. As Armstrong candidly admitted to them in 1726, it was contrary to the laws of Great Britain that a Roman Catholic should serve in His Majesty's army; all His Majesty required of them, he said, was to be faithful subjects, not to join with any enemy, but for their own sakes, to discover all traitorous and evil designs against His Majesty's subjects and Government, and so peaceably and quietly to enjoy and improve their estates.¹⁷ As Cottenrell, the Provincial Secretary, wrote to Captain Scott in 1754, it was "unprecedented to trust our cause in the hands of people of that persuasion, and the nature of our constitution makes it unsafe."¹⁸ Why, then, this ruthless forcing of them to engage to do what the laws of Great Britain, nay, the very "nature of our constitution" absolutely debarred them from doing? I think that we may find in Shirley's letters to the Duke of Bedford a very probable answer to this question. General Lawrence, too, writing to the Board of Trade in 1754, put the matter in a nutshell: "They possess the largest and best tracts of land in this Province. If they refuse the oaths, it would be much better that they were away."¹⁹

In 1754, General Charles Lawrence was made Governor of Nova Scotia. He was a man of hard and resolute temper who had risen, by his own exertions, to high rank in the army. His coming into the Province was the coming also of the bitter tragedy, so long delayed, so long threatening, which moved with such deadly swiftness when once it began. On July 3, 1755, the Acadian Deputies came

¹⁵ Knight's service, or tenure in chivalry, was a feudal tenure of land done away with for the future by 10 Chas. II., st. 24.

¹⁶ N. S. R., 187.

¹⁷ N. S. R., 267.

¹⁸ N. S. R., 209.

¹⁹ N. S. R., 213.

before the Governor and Council at Halifax.²⁰ On being offered the oath of allegiance, in the common form, they replied that they had no power to take it, as Deputies, since the body of the people had not been consulted; they prayed leave, therefore, to go and consult them. The Governor refused this, and insisted that they should take the oath, at least personally. They replied that they were quite ready to repeat the oath of 1730, but must certainly consult the people as to any other. On being called before the Council on the following day, they repeated their refusal to take the oath, in the form required, without consulting the general body of the inhabitants. Upon this, they were informed that, since they had refused the oath directed by law, they could no longer be considered as subjects of His Britannic Majesty, but as having passed to the jurisdiction of the French King. Having made the Deputies withdraw, the Council now resolved that the general body of Acadians should be ordered to send fresh Deputies, with instructions as to taking the oath; that none of these, in future, should be admitted to take it after having once refused it; but that effectual measures must be taken to remove all such "recusants" out of the Province. The Deputies were now recalled, and informed of the brand new law which had just been passed by the Council. Naturally, they assumed that the choice of taking the oath, under the penalties of this new law, was now being offered to them. Dismayed, yielding to the pressure of a very stern necessity—for their refusal now seemed really to involve quitting the Province in beggary—they said, with what deep reluctance may be conceived, that they were, at last, willing to take the oath required. The Council, checkmated, devised, with admirable fertility, yet another new "law." The Deputies were told that for them to take the oath now would be absolutely contrary to a clause in an Act of Parliament, I. George, 2, c. 13, whereby persons who have once refused to take the oaths cannot afterwards be permitted to take them, but are to be considered as Popish recusants. Therefore they were ordered to prison.²¹

It is difficult to comment, temperately, upon these dishonest proceedings. The Deputies, who had become, according to the Council, French subjects, were, for refusing an oath impossible to French subjects, declared to be Popish recusants. Popish, undoubtedly, but how recusants? The very word restored to them their status as British subjects. But they were British subjects to whom the British Government had, over and over again, guaranteed the free exercise of the Catholic faith. What was this illegal introduction of the penal laws into Acadia? Nay, they were recusants for refusing to

²⁰ N. S. R., 247.

²¹ No such statute exists. The entry in Council minutes is probably a misquotation of I. Geo. I., st. 2., c. 13.

bear arms, which was precisely what the penal laws debarred them from doing.²² Further, had they been, in truth, Popish recusants, under the Act of George I., that very act expressly provided that any person, being willing to take the oaths, was free to do so at any time, and should thus escape all the penalties he had incurred.²³ Lawrence may have had some misgivings as to his newly concocted "laws," for, on July 14, he decided to ask Admirals Boscawen and Mostyn, who were in the neighborhood, to come and sit on the Council. As he naïvely explained, he was instructed, by His Majesty, to consult the commander-in-chief of the fleet upon any emergency that might concern the security of the Province. The resolution of the Acadian Deputies to abide by the oath of 1730, until they had consulted their constituents as to taking another, was evidently just such a dangerous emergency as His Majesty had contemplated. On July 15, therefore, the Admirals sailed into the proceedings, and, sitting upon this improvised Imperial Council, were gracious enough to approve of what had been done regarding the Acadians. The Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, Mr. Jonathan Belcher, also approved, and even favored the Council with his advice and encouragement. The Acadians were, he opined, rebels and, collectively, recusants. Moreover, they counted 8,000 souls against the English 3,000, and thus, undoubtedly, stood in the way of the "progress of the settlement." By their non-compliance with the conditions of the treaty of Utrecht, they had forfeited their possessions to the Crown, and, clearly, after the departure of the English fleet and troops, the Province would scarcely be in a position to turn them out; "just such a happy juncture might not occur again," so he advised "against receiving any of the French inhabitants to take the oath," and for the removing of them "all" from the Province.²⁴ This sapient advice was given on July 28, when the Council had received the Deputies from Annapolis River, Mines, Pisiquid and River Canard, all of whom refused the oath. They were imprisoned.

And now, Lawrence, the Chief Justice, the Council, all set to work to devise means for deporting the whole population under their rule. They did not go through the farce of discussing the law. In fact, no law existed which made the forfeiture of real estate absolute on the refusal of any oath, nor did any law make a community guilty of refusing oaths tendered merely to deputies.²⁵ To do the Lords of Trade justice, when they wrote to Lawrence on October 29, 1754, about removing the Acadians, they contemplated dispossessing them

²² Under George I., a Papist who should dare to enlist as a soldier was liable to any punishment by court-martial, short of death. H. II., 170.

²³ The Act I., William and Mary, s. 1, cc. 9, 15, 18, as well as I. Geo. I., st. 2., c. 13, 14, 23, 26; 1714, provided for this. Hughes: II., 164, 173-4.

²⁴ Bancroft: IV., 201.

²⁵ Shea, 428.

by "legal process," which would have meant process and execution in cases taken individually. But legal process is slow process, involving also rights of appeal, whereas Lawrence was greatly hurried—the English fleet and troops being so providentially at hand. It was decided that Colonel Monckton should be charged with the task of dealing with the "recusants": so he was ordered to get the whole male population into his hands by some stratagem, and then—to await transports. The "stratagem" seems to have consisted in getting the men into the churches, reading the sentence of the Council, which was represented to them as the King's, and keeping them prisoners. At Grand-Pré, the embarkation of 1,923 souls began on September 10, and it was December before the last were removed; the wretched people being kept, during the interval, prisoners on the shore, half starved, ill-clothed and ill-sheltered in the appalling Northern cold. In the same way, all over the Province, the families of some 9,000 persons were broken up, packed into sloops like cattle, with no regard for family ties, and shipped off. A few escaped their guards, before being driven on board the sloops, and fled into the forests. But Lawrence was ruthless. "If you find that fair means will not do with them," he wrote to Colonel Winslow, "you must proceed by the most vigorous measures possible—depriving those who escape of all means of shelter, by burning their houses, and destroying everything that may afford them the means of subsistence."²⁶ "Use every means to distress as much as can be, those who attempt to conceal themselves in the woods," were his words to Monckton. The orders were doubtless carried out efficiently upon the fugitives, for, as an officer wrote at this time, "Our soldiers hate them, and if they can but find a pretext to kill them, they will."²⁷ At any rate, the soldiers burned and destroyed. Grand-Pré went up in flames, and many another village. In the Mines district, alone, 250 houses and a greater number of barns were burnt. The fine flocks and herds became the spoils of the English officials. Thus was desolation made in Acadia—there was silence on the busy farms; the tilled fields lay unsown; wild and bitter growths choked the orchards; the sea crept through the neglected dykes, and lay cold upon the meadows; half-wild dogs howled about the deserted villages.

The exiles fared as exiles have mostly fared, finding neither welcome nor solace in the lands upon whose mercies they were thrown. Perhaps the Council at Halifax, with Lawrence and the Admirals, seemed to the other Governors in America to have some smack of imperial authority about it, or doubtless they would have hastened to ship the unwelcome Acadians back to Acadia. But let it

²⁶ N. S. R., 273.

²⁷ Bancroft: IV., 204.

be recorded of them that they did what they could.²⁸ Dinwiddie, Governor of Virginia, misliking the presence of "biggotted Papists," to whom he refused all practice of their religion, managed to ship off 1,040 of them to England, and to drive off from his coasts a party of fifty refugees, who had been driven off already from South Carolina. Governor Lyttleton writes so early as 1756, to Fox, that of the 1,027 refugees who had been landed in South Carolina, 109 were already dead, he had "got rid of 273," and the rest, among whom were only 171 men, he had "distributed," binding them out in various parishes and districts—binding indeed with cords, handcuffing and fettering these "originally unwellcome" guests, whose "Roman Catholick Religion" was not tolerated. Massachusetts was deeply aggrieved that 1,000 Acadians, "in unsanitary conditions," had been thrown on its resources, for the Province not only found Roman Catholics in general "obnoxious," but had been so shocked at the "obstinacy" of these French parents, who objected to having their children torn from them, that it had passed a law to sanction their forcible abduction. Besides all this annoyance, it found itself compelled to spend two shillings sterling per head, each week, in order to keep alive aged refugees, and very young children—altogether an intolerable burden. The task of keeping the refugees alive, however, was, in some places, considerably lightened. For instance, when in November, 1755, only two months after the deportations began, three vessels entered the Delaware, bearing 454 of the exiles, these were so ill-clothed and so sickly, after the hardships they had undergone, that more than half died on landing."²⁹ Georgia refused to allow any Acadians at all to remain within its frontiers; and if Maryland fell short of this standard, at all events, it "did nothing whatever" to help the 900 cast upon its mercies—nay, it even forbade their fellow-Catholics to shelter any of the poor wanderers. For the exiles wandered, as exiles must always wander, and time brought little peace. They might have said, with a modern poet:

"The years, like great black oxen, tread the world,
And God, the herdsman, goads them on behind,
And I am broken by their passing feet."³⁰

They drank very deeply of the cup of sorrow. One Governor, more pitiful than the rest, even wrote: "If policy could acquiesce in any measure for their relief, humanity loudly calls for it." Humanity, however, was left—to call. But although, as one of the melancholy Acadian hymns has it:

²⁸ H. 277, II., xxviii.

²⁹ Shea, 433.

³⁰ Yeats.

“Tout passe
 Sous le firmament,
 Tout n'est que changement,
 Tout passe—
 Les champs, les rangs,
 Les petits et les grands,
 Tout passe.”

They sang also with better hope, in the words of another :

“Vive Jésus!
 Avec la Croix son cher partage,
 Vive Jésus!
 Dans les cœurs de tous ses élus!
 Le Croix de son cœur est le gage,
 Est-il plus bel partage?
 Vive Jésus!
 Portons la Croix!”³¹

Truly, this people seemed to think their religion “most precious.” Meanwhile into Acadia, black still from the incendiary fires, poured the eager new settlers—from Massachusetts, from New York and the other Provinces, squatters legalized, adventurers all. The fine farms, the rich lands, what was left of the herds, fell straight into their hands. Many a “Protestant family” must have blessed Lawrence and the Admirals who had made this incredible thing possible. The settlers settled indeed, and entrenched themselves—even legally. In 1758, when they first met in Assembly—the Acadians had never been allowed to have an Assembly—they legislated to render any Papist incapable of holding land in the country, until he apostatized; and the old Salem law against Jesuits was reënacted against all priests in Nova Scotia. In 1759, grown bolder, they passed an “Act for the quieting of possession to the Protestant grantees of the land formerly occupied by the French inhabitants, and for preventing vexatious actions relating to the same.” By this act, no Acadian owner could ever recover his property. In 1766, they legislated against Papist schools and schoolmasters. The Protestant succession being thus duly secured, the unhappy Province passed into the shadow of that “Magna Charta” against Catholicism, the Act of 1698, and the still blacker shade of the anti-Catholic spirit, which vitiated the whole spiritual and intellectual atmosphere of the eighteenth century. This, I believe to be the true history of “Evangeline.” Further comment is, assuredly, not required.

NOTE—There has been some controversy as to the tenor of the oath taken by the Acadians to the English Crown. In 1715, the people of Port Royal signed the following: “Je promets et jure que je veux être fidèle et tenir une véritable allégeance a S. M. le Roi George tant que je serai a l'Acadie et Nouvelle Écosse.” (Roche, II., 118). On September 25, 1726, the Acadian Deputies took the oath of allegiance, with a clause exempting them from bearing arms. (N. S. R., 67). In 1730 the whole population signed the

³¹ H. II., 181.

following: "Je promets et jure sincèrement en foi de Chrétien, que je serai entièrement fidèle et obeirai vraiment S. M. le roi George II. que je reconnoi pour le Souverain Seigneur de l'Acadie ou Nouvelle Écosse. Ainsi Dieu me soit en aide." (N. S. R., 84). But it was allowed that they were exempt from bearing arms. When, afterwards, the unconditional oath was pressed upon them, they always replied that they would swear as they had sworn in 1730, "with an exemption for us and our heirs from bearing arms." (N. S. R., 173). The oath demanded from them by Lawrence, on July 3, 1755, was "the oath of allegiance in the common form" (N. S. R., 254) or "the oath of allegiance to H. M. unqualified." (N. S. R., 259. Lawrence to Bd. of Trade, July 18, 1755). As we have seen, the Acadian Deputies to a man, refused it. Akin, in maintaining that the oath of 1730 was "unconditional" (N. S. R., 266, note); Shea, in insisting that the oaths demanded were anti-Catholic, seem to be equally wide of the mark.

M. G. CHADWICK.

Rome, Italy.

THE GOLDEN AGE OF ENGLISH ELOQUENCE.

LIKE the Greek, and unlike the Latin, the climax of the oratorical literature of the English language is considerably antedated by the golden age of its poetry. English poetry, like the Greek, reached its zenith with the thrill of national exultation and activity produced by the overthrow of a mighty force which had menaced the national autonomy. The same cause which quickened the national spirit and heightened the national enthusiasm for military exploits and discovery gave to the national poetry the creative impulse which stamped the period as the Golden Age.

But, in both literatures, oratory comes later, when each nation is showing signs of military decadence. Upon each nation is exerted a pressure which appears to be the cause of the pre-eminence of the period in oratory, as it forms, explicitly or implicitly, the theme of most of the orations which have made that period great in the annals of eloquence. That force is the encroachment of despotism upon democracy. For Athens it was personified in Philip the Macedonian, for England in George the Third. In each instance a plant of foreign culture in the shape of monarchical absolutism was attempting to take root in a soil whence the essentials of its sustenance had long been expelled. In Athens a new fertility had been provided for the exotic growth and it found nourishment amid the corrupt wreckage of Athenian patriotism. In England the native forces of the soil combined and successfully accomplished the destruction of the intruding herb.

The pressure upon Athens came from without. The Athenian spirit of liberty, once so flourishing, had lost its power of resistance. "Where is the Pyrrhic phalanx gone?" might have been asked of the Athenians of Demosthenes' day as well as of those who aroused the rage and disgust of Lord Byron when he looked to them for examples of the spirit of Pericles. And so Athens fell, and Macedon rose upon her ruins.

With England it was an internal ailment which troubled the body politic. More than two hundred years before the period of which we write Henry the Eighth had been able to set back the progress of English democracy almost to the point from which it had begun. In the period between him and George the Third, the British Constitution, though more slowly and laboriously than before, had resumed its upward course. Long before it attained its goal the last strenuous resistance on the part of despotism was offered it in the person of George the Third. And

who knows whether, like Philip, George might not have succeeded, or whether, like that of Demosthenes, the eloquence of Chatham, Burke and the rest might not have failed of its object, had not the transatlantic branch of the British nation, by force of arms, espoused the cause of British liberties and read to despotism in the unmistakable terms of fire and sword the lesson that all men are created free and equal?

While some of the greatest orations of the Golden Age of English Eloquence deal with the encroachments of despotism at home, others have for their theme equally menacing but opposite tendencies abroad. The latter half of the period is marked by the bitter opposition of Burke and the younger Pitt to the French Revolution. When the reaction against centralization came in France and the straitened spirit of freedom burst all bonds and madly overflowed the confines of France, threatening the established forms of government in other lands, conservative, sober thinkers in England were among the first to take alarm. The voice of Burke was raised against the "colleges of armed fanatics" who had succeeded in obtaining control of French affairs, and, while many Englishmen had at first sympathized with the French, from then on to Waterloo it was England who was the main figure in the struggle of Europe against the viper which had been nourished in her bosom. The French proffers of help to any nation that wished to change its form of government, the violent change in their own, the devouring ambition of Napoleon, all tended to create the most active resistance to the propagation of French revolutionary principles. Hence the British eloquence of the last twenty years of the period we are treating bears a deep impress of the influence of this mighty continental convulsion.

The great task, then, which was presented to British orators during the Golden Age of English Eloquence was to guide the national energies safely between the menace of despotism from within as the one extreme and the anarchy which threatened from without as the other. Their middle course was assisted and indicated by the American Revolution. In some measure the great English statesmen of the day perceived this. Fox spoke of an English victory over the Americans as "the terrible news from Long Island." Chatham, with characteristic vehemence, exclaimed, "If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, I would never lay down my arms!" Burke summarized the case for the colonies when he said that "the feelings of the colonies were formerly the feelings of Great Britain."

The next step in the search for the influences which bore upon British oratory of the Golden Age takes us to the Far East, to the

sacred banks of the Ganges, the mountains of Oude and the plains of the Carnatic. In the course of the fight against oppression of the Hindoos by minions of the East India Company the great men whose eloquence guided the British senate produced many of their noblest orations. No more glorious opportunity for disinterested service in the cause of the oppressed was ever presented to an orator, and it would be temerity indeed to state that any orator ever rose to an occasion more nobly and fearlessly than did Burke, Fox and Sheridan. Though they failed to attain the direct object of their labors, yet it was, as Burke himself expressed it, "for these services, in which for fourteen years they had shown the most industry and had the least success, namely, in the affairs of India, that they valued themselves the most." By the might of oratory and the force of personal appeal had the lesson been taught that "Asiatics have rights and Europeans obligations."

I am insisting so much upon these influences upon the Golden Age of English Eloquence because, while oratory is an art,—and perhaps the noblest,—like all other arts it does its best work when it is a "by-product of propaganda." "If you want art," says Mr. Chesterton, "you must go to the doctrinaires." The principle of art for art's sake is the source of a great deal of what is lifeless, insipid and jejune in art. Oratory, in all its highest flights, bears the universal hall-mark of having been produced for a purpose, practical, definite and earnest.

But while the mighty upheavals of society, and the conflict between the opposite forces of democracy and despotism filled men's minds with great ideas which called for great expression, and while stirring victories and crushing defeats on land and sea afforded that definiteness and concreteness which are the most fertile sources of oratorical power, nevertheless these alone could not have made men eloquent had they not been already prepared as fit and ready instruments to attack the mighty questions which presented a wealth of plastic material to the touch of their genius. Oratory is an art in which excellence is attained in proportion to the grandeur of the edifice of culture which is raised upon the foundation of natural gifts. The more solid the foundation, it is true, the better chance has the superstructure for permanence, and the greater splendor can it receive in the finishing processes, but, as a broad foundation does not make a beautiful or even a useful building, so natural gifts alone without a large measure of culture do not make an orator.

The eighteenth century in England was just the period to furnish the peculiar sort of culture which produces great oratory, and which in turn, is wielded by that art as its most effective instrument. The

first throbbings of the scientific activity of the nineteenth century were yet to be felt, consequently the classic languages did not find their preëminence in academic curricula disputed by any of the so-called utilitarian branches. The aim of the study of literature and language is not the imparting of information, but the development of power. The most active power of his soul are brought into play in the orator's exercise of his art. The study of literature and languages is well adapted to the cultivation of these powers, in its "spiritual enlargement, clarification and discipline of young hearts and minds and will, which are to be touched to finer issues by its potent ministry."

The young men who were to mark the latter half of the eighteenth century as the Golden Era of British Eloquence gave themselves up with ardor to the influence of the classics. With the single exception of Erskine, whose knowledge of Greek extended to scarcely more than the alphabet, all the greatest orators of the period had derived from the masters of Greek and Roman thought that rich mental nutrition which their genius sought so earnestly and assimilated so thoroughly. Chatham, Pitt and Fox form the great triumvirate which furnishes proof of the potential energy stored up by the thinkers of Greece and Rome unto future ages. Chatham used the classics as an anvil on which to shape and give effective form to the molten masses of his mighty passions, which afterwards, like some Jove of eloquence, he was to hurl at the Titans who disputed his sway in the House of Commons. The lesson which the classics contained for him was one of style, of outward form. His own passion furnished the material. The classics kneaded and molded the glowing mass, trained and disciplined the gigantic force. He translated and retranslated Demosthenes, endeavoring to make each successive version both a fitter vehicle of the Greek orator's thought and passion and more conformable to the highest standards of his own native English.

Pitt and Fox gazed long into the depths of the Springs of Helicon and took copious draughts of their crystal waters of wisdom, assimilating them to their very substance and transforming them into the brawn and sinew of debate. Burke, too, was a great lover of the ancient classics. Among them Demosthenes was his favorite orator, although Cicero became to a greater extent his model. But Burke's genius had an element in it to which all the wealth of those ancient minds could but faintly respond. His ruling passion was not love of power nor love of pleasure, nor love of money, but "a passion for order and for justice." Moral sublimity was the nutriment which his mental appetite craved, and the store of this to be found in the classics was dry and impoverished beside

the wealth of it which the literature of his own land could afford him. Shakespeare and Milton were his delight. For the latter especially he had an esteem amounting to reverence. In these poets he had "a richer fund of sweetness and light, more and better food for the intellectual soul, a larger provision of such thoughts as should dwell together with the spirit of a man and be twisted about his heart forever than in the collective poetry of the whole ancient heathen world." As, in their own field, were the great authors who were his inspiration, Burke is the most truly national and has also left the noblest legacy to English literature, of the orators whose careers make up the Golden Age of English Eloquence.

To the youth of England who were fortunate enough to obtain their education at one of the great universities,—and it was from this class that all the prominent orators of the day were recruited,—was presented in close and thrilling perspective the eagerly longed-for sphere of their future activity, the "favorite habitation, the chosen temple of the goddess Fame," the British House of Commons. The governing class of England, those, namely, who might hope for a voice in her legislative halls, was, in that day, smaller than it is now. The number of those who, by reason of exceptional talent, or family influence, could hope for real leadership and eminence there, was very small, indeed. The youth of the nation who might, ever so remotely, look forward to success in the struggle for civic prominence and power did not have to crane their necks over the heads of a vast multitude in order to see the destined arena of their future achievements. They felt as the aspiring young athlete feels who listens to the applause showered upon some hero of the diamond or gridiron, and who, from within his own sinews, draws the assurance that with the requisite expenditure of effort such a triumph may one day be his own. The field of battle was constantly before their eyes. The laurels won thereon adorned the brows of friends and relatives. They fought its conflicts over again in mimic warfare. They organized miniature Houses of Parliament in which the sham battles of Whig and Tory were waged with full as much zest as the genuine contests of their fathers. The result was that they entered public life with a sense of personal fitness and a self-confidence which gave them a rare power in wielding the weapons of eloquence. They had been to the manner born and bred.

The influence of the art entered even into the recreations of the men of those days. The Golden Age of English Oratory coincides with that of the English stage, with the era of David Garrick and Mrs. Siddons, and no one who accepts Demosthenes' opinion of the first requisite of an orator, especially if *hypokrisis* be translated

not by "action," but by "acting," needs to be told how close is the connection between the eloquence of the stage and that of the rostrum.

Together with the theatre as a means of instruction, imaginative development and recreation, another institution contributed largely to the formation of men whose influence over the destinies of a great nation depended in large part upon their ability to sway the minds of others by the force of eloquent personal appeal. This was what, for want of a better name, we may call the intellectual circle, of which the club that centred about Doctor Johnson, and the brilliant assemblage of men who frequented the court of Prince Frederick at Leicester House are perhaps typical, each of a different variety of learned group. The former was scholarly first and social afterward. The latter reversed the order, but nevertheless its atmosphere of learning, created as it was by the brilliance, the wit, the knowledge, the dignity, the courtliness of Chesterfield, Carteret, Pulteney and Bolingbroke had "more effect in making Lord Chatham the orator that he was than all his rhetorical studies, prodigious and unexampled as the latter were."

If we consider the dictum of Daniel Webster that the three productive essentials of a great oration are "the man, the subject and the occasion," we find the explanation of the phenomenon that all the important speeches of the ten foremost English orators were delivered in the fifty years from 1760 to 1810. These men were nearly all drawn from the ranks of the aristocracy which, curiously enough, formed the chief defense of English liberties when the King and the people, the latter blindly, had combined to overthrow them. They were the men who received the boon of a classical education, whose training was shaped with the one end in view of a political and oratorical career. The young aspirant for fame sniffed an atmosphere laden with the smoke of oratorical combat, and, like the smell of powder to a soldier chafing in inaction, it nerved him to the highest pitch of excitement for the fray. The mighty issues which followed close upon one another throughout the period, the American War, the struggle against East Indian oppression, the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, the agitation against the slave-trade, the half hidden contest against royal usurpation of power, together with the great social upheaval which was just beginning its leavening process in society from the bottom upward,—all these provided ready and almost boundless material for the trained genius of the young orators who were to make the period unique in the annals of eloquence. The theatre of their activity was, for the most part, the British Parliament, which provided a fitting audience and a fitting occasion for nearly every

speech that was delivered, by reason of its embodiment of the majesty of government. At times an even more august concourse was present to spur the orator on to his greatest efforts, as, for instance, the assemblage which attended the opening of the Begum trial, "an audience," says Macaulay, "such as has rarely excited the fears or the emulations of an orator." As in a vast alembic, the very best and most responsive material was treated by the most energetic of agents, the trained powers of mind and heart and body of the elite of British orators, and from the white heat developed in their contact emerged the magnificent product of eloquence bequeathed to us by a Chatham, a Burke, a Sheridan, a Fox, a Pitt, an Erskine. Of these the greatest were unquestionably Chatham and Burke.

The progress of the eighteenth century was leaving behind the period of dynastic struggles and wars of succession and was entering upon the most momentous era of modern history when Lord Chatham began his whirlwind career of activity in the British House of Commons. Although he had entered Parliament in 1735 and had made himself a power from the very first, setting his face against official corruption, incessantly championing the cause of "the popular part of the Constitution," this part of his career fades into insignificance beside that on which he entered in 1754.

It was a day of preparation and foreboding. The mightiest changes since the Reformation were about to come upon Europe, changes which cast their shadows before, even to our own day. The old issues were to fade and die. The old war-cries are to be forgotten, and new, unheard of maxims of "liberty, fraternity, equality" are to resound in their stead. The bugle blast that ushered in the Seven Years' War let loose upon Europe a gigantic tide of political change. As a prelude, the vast colonial empire of France was to pass under the sway of England. Then, in one breathless rush from change to change, from crisis to crisis, from upheaval to upheaval, amid tottering thrones, delirious peoples, warring nations, "England has to undergo the revolt of the American colonies; to submit to defeat and separation; to shake under the volcano of the French Revolution; to grapple and fight for her life with her gigantic enemy Napoleon; to gasp and rally after that momentous struggle"; to build up the mightiest of commercial empires; to renovate her parliamentary system throughout; and finally to settle down to a long era of comparative peace, contentment and material prosperity under the "Bourgeois Compromise."

It is certain that England, bereft of the results of Chatham's genius for guidance during the period from 1758 to 1762, would have entered upon the era which was to transform Europe hope-

lessly beaten, outweighed and insignificant at the very beginning of the struggle. All through the course of these vicissitudes Englishmen could point back to Chatham and his victorious policy as the source of the vigor and vitality which upheld their country in times of social and political turmoil and upheaval. It was one of the greatest achievements of his genius that "commerce, for the first time, was united with and made to flourish by war." For such a triumph a united Parliament and a united nation were absolutely necessary. In proportion as dissension and jealousy reigned at home would the English arms abroad be weak and ineffective. Pitt's genius for leadership gave to the world the spectacle of a Nation of Shopkeepers "engaging in a costly war with a unanimity that was prodigious." During the time of his second ministry the House of Commons rejected no proposals, debated no measures, thwarted no schemes. This unparalleled ascendancy over a body of men notoriously dissentient and difficult to control was secured almost entirely by Chatham's masterly and triumphant eloquence. Such was his personal prestige that it was well said that at this time Pitt was Parliament.

Lord Chatham was a typical representative of that class of orators who are great through personal appeal, as distinguished from those who, like Burke, are more highly esteemed when read than when listened to. At the present day to place the printed works of Chatham beside those of Burke is to cast the former entirely into the shade. In depth of feeling, perhaps, they do not suffer so much by the comparison; in dignity they often gain by it, but in thought, in reasoning power, in the vision of profound principles, in the sublimity of the topic of genius, in word and phrase rhythm, in wealth of illustrative material, they appear puny. Yet it is doubtful whether one who had listened to both orators on the same day or on the same subject would have remembered that he had heard Burke speak at all. Chatham's mighty figure,—even in his days of decrepitude and disease the very personification of majesty,—the marvelous voice, the eloquent glance, the entire personal action, and, above all, the irresistible force of complete and passionate conviction, tempered, moulded, trained, developed, polished and organized by years of drudgery in the classics and in the art of delivery, would have so filled the listener's imaginative horizon as to blot out everything else. There was a chivalry about the Great Commoner that filled the mind's eye long after the tones of his voice had died upon the ear. His hearers felt that "the man was infinitely greater than the orator," that the mighty eloquence which captivated and enchained their senses was but an expression of an honor, a patriotism, an integrity of spirit to which they could afford

to entrust their minds and feelings for guidance. This was the dominant note of his position in the English Parliament. He guided, ruled, held sway over men's minds. That is why his speeches are not models of careful reasoning. He spoke with the inspiration and exaltation of undoubted and admitted superiority, at times wit halmost the prescience of vision.

While, for the reasons we have given, the literary legacy of Lord Chatham is not nearly equal to that of some other orators, nevertheless his greatest orations, being at least equal to others as regards the subjects and the occasions, are so preëminent in fulfillment of Webster's third requisite, namely the man, that, in the sense that an orator is one who is listened to rather than read, we may safely, without fear of contradiction, term him the greatest of English orators.

Edmund Burke occupies to a certain extent the same place in English prose that Shakespeare does in English poetry. He is unique, a man apart, a source whence others may draw inspiration according to their several capacities, a fountain whose waters are endowed with animating and vivifying properties drawn from depths beyond the reach of ordinary human ken. For Burke was a seer, a high-priest, a prophet. The dominant notes of his genius were insight and penetration. To no question of politics, justice, morality or government were his powers applied, but clear down out of other men's sight, down to very first principles he went, to their relations with the laws of eternal truth and right; and there making his beginning and shaping his course, he built up his opinion step by step, giving to the world a pregnant philosophy in connection with each of the subjects to which he turned his hand. He looked over the heads of an assembly which, to the mere parliamentary debater, was all in all, out into the wide world. His audience was mankind, and mankind engaged in the highest and noblest and most beneficial of merely human pursuits, that of civil government. If the day ever comes when the English language retires from the marts and the highways and the senate-houses of men of action, to take its place beside the ancient tongues in the classroom and the closet, the fame of Chatham, Fox and the rest will be nothing more than a "*nominis umbra*," remembered as that of men who did somewhat in their day to contribute to the greatness of a once mighty nation, whose importance grows ever dimmer in the lengthening perspective of the years. But as long as men live in cities and towns; as long as they attempt to govern their monarchies, oligarchies, democracies, their republics, kingdoms and empires according to the principles of human nature and divine guidance, just so long will the voice of Burke sound trumpet-like

from the study, from the campaign platform, from the parliamentary rostrum, an oracle of safe guidance both to those who are set in high places to govern and alike to those "that have but just enough of sense to know the master's voice."

It has been observed above that Burke belongs to the class of those who, if the actual spoken word be deemed the chief essential of oratory, may almost be denominated essayists as well as orators. The impression made by his performances in the House was never equal to that which the same orations created when printed and conned at leisure. People wondered how they could have been so thoroughly insensate to beauty and power as to meet his efforts with inattention or impatience. In a certain sense Burke was too great to be an orator. His usual audience was too emphatically ordinary to hitch its wagon to a star, and when Burke straddled his Pegasus for a ~~meteor~~ flight through the ethereal regions of fancy and imagery, they,—deliberately often—remained behind, and chose to walk on terra firma. They much preferred Chatham, with his champing, fire-breathing war-horse, or Fox, who stripped himself of all encumbrances and rode light, or Pitt, at whose every stride could be heard the increasing chink of the national money-bags which hung at his saddle. Burke brought to bear upon his raw material an imaginative fire which made it glow to a pitch far too bright to produce any but a blinding effect upon an audience which had picture after picture flashed before them with bewildering rapidity. But when transferred to paper and conned over at leisure, these very speeches are seen to be the productions of a mind that explored every nook and corner for material illustrating his subject, and laid the whole upon a foundation of logic and a true instinct for first principles that showed him to have the keenest insight into human nature and the workings of the human mind.

His work on the French Revolution, in spite of the fact that his policy will find few defenders to-day, is, perhaps, greater than any of his speeches or all of them together. It is true he overlooked certain facts in French social life, the consideration of which was essential to the formation of a correct judgment of the great cataclysm, but he certainly did not overlook what every one else failed to see, that the method in which the Revolution was to be carried out would be such as would eventually alienate from it the sympathies of all decent men. If, as one of its supporters declares, "the gospel of the Revolution was the Contrat Social" then Burke merely judged the Revolutionaries out of their own mouths right at the beginning. As ever he went straight to first principles, and he arrived at them so fast that other men were left behind, stumbling over the obstacles which the complicated situation placed

in the way of their reaching the same conclusions as he did, and which most of them eventually did reach. The principle which Burke grasped immediately was that whatever the need of a revolution, the men who were behind the Revolution in France, with their "Encyclopedie" and their "Ecrasez L'infame," their "Egalité, Humanité, Fraternité" and the rest of their shibboleth and mumery, were certainly not the men to carry it through to a successful, moderate and beneficial conclusion. At least in this judgment has history concurred with him.

When English-speaking people are in quest of sound maxims of political and social morality it is to the eloquence of Burke and his contemporaries that they turn. In them "the ancient constitutional policy of the kingdom found its most lofty expression." They were the interpreters to mankind of the principles of equality and sound government as elaborated by the genius of the English people. Their influence has been felt in the government of the Dominion of Canada, and in the new-made constitution of the Australian Commonwealth. And if, at the present time, the name of England is become a reproach and a by-word among the nations for her treatment of Ireland, it is because a parcel of political blunderers have departed from the traditions and principles of Burke and Chatham.

While Burke stands head and shoulders above the rest in his contributions to posterity, both in the domain of political thought and that of literary effort, yet the other orators of the period have left monuments of eloquence not unworthy of the stirring times in which they lived. Chatham showed to students of the English language its capabilities for "all that was bold and commanding in eloquence." Fox gave splendid and unparalleled exhibitions of keenness in debate. Pitt set a model for lucidity of treatment and the happy amplification of a subject. Lord Mansfield gave an example of judicial dignity and unvarying loftiness in the handling of a theme. Junius, although defective in purpose and nobility of thought, showed the possibilities of orderly presentation of argument to a degree that has never been surpassed. Lord Erskine made most valuable contributions both to the art of forensic oratory and in the domain of legal opinion. These men had great things to say, and an audience stirred by great events to say them to. The day had not yet come when the fashion of saying everything in the language of the street or of the stock exchange precluded the possibility of the elegant or literary treatment of political or other subjects. Not that these great orators made the great issues which they debated an occasion for the wanton display of curious ingenuity or rhetorical facility. Far from it. Rather they brought to

their tasks an elevated genius, shaped and trained by persevering study of their great masters, the ancients, with the result that the combination of thought and wisdom with fitting expression contained in their productions stamps the period of their activity as the Golden Age of British Eloquence.

FRANK J. PURCELL.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE RISE AND FALL OF A GREAT METROPOLIS.

THE traveler in Italy must sooner or later become inured to signs of fallen greatness. If he is forced to submit to the tutelage of guides, details of it will soon pall on him, for this is their special field. They know the number of marble columns that stood in each villa on the ruined moles of Baii and tell the number of banquets that were served in the halls of the Cæsars on the Palatine, and they drive all sense of the picturesqueness of history from the mind of their victim. But even the sorely-tried traveler who turns aside from the beaten track of tourists, and wanders up the northern shore of the Adriatic to where the old Aemilian road skirted the sea under the shadow of the mountains, and, looking on the scattered houses grouped round the Basilica of Aquileia, reflects that here stood once the second city in the Roman Empire, will have forced on him inevitably thought that say "Sic transit"

Twenty-one centuries have just passed—as nearly as we can reckon—since P. Nasica. L. Flaminius and L. Manlius Accidinus founded the little colony on the northeastern frontier of Italy, not far from the place where legend said Antenor sailed up the mouth of the rushing Timavus towards its nine sources and founded a city for his Heneti, the ancestors of the Veneti of later years. Rome's power was steadily progressing northwards, but the war with Hannibal had interrupted the advance. When peace came with the battle of Zama, the Celts below the Alps knew the fate that was coming, and anticipated the expected onslaught by a widespread insurrection. The struggle lasted for many years, years of difficult guerilla warfare in the Maritime Alps and Upper Appennines, but one by one the tribes were defeated and the victorious Roman army steadily advanced the frontier of the Republic. This time it was no mere punitive expedition, for Rome had determined on a permanent conquest and would close forever the gates of the Alps against the Celtic nation. At the same time the conquest of the northern shore of the Adriatic was begun. The son of the great Marcellus led the Roman legions to Trieste and Istria, and the Illyrians were stirred in their coastal homes. To consolidate both these conquests an outpost was needed against threatened invasion. A colony was founded there where the Alps close down to the sea, across the bay from Trieste, facing the newly-conquered Istrian peninsula. Forces were placed there and the Roman eagle was planted facing the foe. The "Aquila" suggested the name and it was called Aquileia.

Like many another of the Republic's outposts it was hardly built when it was sacked. A consular army marching near it was ambushed by the King of Epulia and his Istrian allies, and would have been annihilated but for the temptation of plunder that the new colony held out. The Romans had thus time to recover and drive out the invaders, but the first blood had been shed in the streets of Aquileia. Years of peace then followed in that corner of Italy, Macedonia and Carthage occupying the attention of the restless Republic. These years were spent in preparing for war, and the colony grew and the importance of its position ever increased. It came to be regarded as the link between Rome and the "near East," and was the starting-place of the roads to the neighboring Roman provinces and to the mountain passes of the Alpine ranges on the North and East. Julius Cæsar made it the headquarters of his forces in Cisalpine Gaul, and for many years it remained the winter quarters of the legions, whence they issued to tighten the Roman grip on the grand circle of the Alps.

With this increasing importance Aquileia gradually developed into a great city until, under Augustus, it became a rival of Rome itself. Temples and palaces had been built, it possessed a great amphitheatre and sumptuous baths, its monuments and statues were the product of the best art of the day. Augustus had an imperial palace built, and lived there for many years, and his successors continued to do so until the days of Theodosius. With the emperor came his court, and a brilliant suburb of palatial villas was soon added to the city. A mint, a manufactory of arms and looms for the production of linen and woolen cloths were set up. The harbor boasted a huge dockyard and naval arsenal, and it became one of the chief stations of the fleet. The splendor and luxury of the city and the beauty and health-giving qualities of the surrounding country were sung by the poets. Livia, the wife of Augustus, attributed her long life to her stay there and to the wine of the neighboring Pucinum (now Duino), which became famous throughout the Empire, and, as Livy tells us, found favor even with the fastidious Greeks.

Under the succeeding emperors the population and the wealth of the city increased. Five legions were stationed there to guard the half million inhabitants, and to its shores came ships laden with the rich merchandise of the East. Then in the midst of this pagan splendor was heard the first word of the doctrine of Christ. Legend has it that St. Mark, who accompanied SS. Peter and Paul to Rome, was sent to bring the faith to the northern metropolis, and a chapel marks the spot on the shore of the lagoon where local tradition says the Evangelist landed. There he is supposed to have worked with

marked success for several years, until, desirous of seeing once again his chief, he returned to Rome, committing his community of the faithful to the charge of St. Hermagoras, who became its first Bishop. Persecution came to try the ever-increasing body of Christians, and the Bishop died with many of his flock. He was succeeded by his deacon, St. Fortunatus, who was in his turn also martyred, and these two first Bishops are now the joint patrons of the see. Still the Church flourished there, and in the middle of the second century it gave, in St. Pius I., a Pope to the Church.

Aquileia now rose to the highest point of its glory. It was styled by contemporary writers, "*Roma secunda*," "*Maxima Italiae urbs*," "*Italiae emporium*," "*frequentissima*," "*praedives*." For more than two centuries it was to remain with its glory undimmed, but its long period of peace would be broken by wars and the terrors of assault. From its position it was always liable to attack, and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius had it strongly fortified, making it the principal fortress of the Empire against the barbarians of the North and East. Within a very few years its strength was tested, the Marcomanni came to its walls, and during the fierce civil wars of the Empire it was the scene of numerous battles. When the Thracian giant who ruled for three years as the Emperor Maximin found himself deposed he marched on the city before attacking Rome. Crossing the river, swollen by the melting snow, on a bridge of huge hogsheads, he rooted up the rich vineyards and laid low the splendid suburbs, using the timber beams of the houses to make engines with which to attack the city. An interval of peace had by that time allowed the walls to fall into decay, but they were quickly repaired, and the valor of the defenders made up for the poor quality of their defenses. Maximin, indignant at the slow conquest, vented his anger against the soldiers, and his cruelty aroused their enmity and hate. He was murdered by his own men and thus the city was spared. The pagan inhabitants attributed the victory to their deity Belenus, who, they declared, fought with them, and the Roman senate, identifying the Celtic God with Apollo, offered public thanksgiving to him. The women of Aquileia had their share, too, in the victory, for they had, following the Carthaginian example, sacrificed their hair to make ropes for the engines of defense, and in memory of this now rose the temple of Venus the Bald. This increase of pagan cult naturally hampered the spread of Christianity, persecution followed, and some years later we find another Bishop, St. Hilarius, dying a martyr for the faith.

The fourth century was a remarkable one in the history of the city. Constantine the Great chose it as the place of his marriage in the early years of the century, and the gorgeous festivities then

celebrated greatly increased its fame. When it became clear that with the growing extent and importance of the Eastern Empire, Rome was no longer suited by its position to be the capital, the claims of Aquileia as the central capital became apparent. But sentiment forbade anything that would destroy the dignity of Old Rome. Constantine chose rather to build a New Rome in the East that would not supersede the historic capital but would merely be its Eastern counterpart, and so Byzantium was his choice. Aquileia was still, however, to be remembered by Constantine, for in its neighborhood a few years later his eldest son was murdered by his brother's soldiers.

The city lay near the line of march of Julian the Apostate, when, after being hailed Emperor by the revolting Gallic legions, he abjured the Christian faith and led his soldiers against Constantine. He had passed the city by and was continuing his march to the Eastern capital when two legions raised the banner of Constantine in Aquileia. The usurper could not leave a hostile force thus menacing what would be his only line of retreat if he were to fail in his purpose, and so the march was delayed and Jovinus was sent to take the city. A long siege seemed imminent, as the fortifications were deemed impregnable, but the city was spared the agony, for the timely death of Constantine ended the civil war and brought peace—though a pagan peace—to the Empire.

For the Christians, however, no peace came. The years that followed were troubled ones. Persecution broke loose upon them again under the rule of Julian and within the Church itself the heresy of Arianism caused dissension little less disastrous. Council after council was held, sincere men were misunderstood and saints tortured and exiled. Intrigue and violence were used and personal issues were forced under the guise of dogmatic zeal. Heretical emperors persecuted the faithful with all the bitterness of their pagan predecessors. But through it all the truth triumphed and gradually the tide of battle turned in favor of Catholic tradition. As an intellectual movement the heresy spent its force; there remained at length only local defenders and interested partisans. At Aquileia the last struggle was fought and the victory for the Church was finally won, when St. Ambrose, presiding at the famous Council held there in 381, secured the deposition of the last remaining Arianizing prelates of the West.

The city was at this time the chief ecclesiastical city of the district around the north of the Adriatic. When its Bishop had attended the Council held in Rome in 337, he took his place immediately after the Pope. During the reign of Constantine a church, the "*magnificum templum*" of a contemporary chronicler, was built. At the

time of the Council of Aquileia, to which we have referred, St. Valerian was Bishop, and he then received the dignity of metropolitan of the churches of the district. The city had further importance in the Church at this time apart from its official position, for religious studies and rigorous ecclesiastical discipline flourished there, and it held a little knot of men who were the nucleus of an enterprise which from weak beginnings was to develop into a great and important movement. It was the capital of the province of St. Jerome, and the young Dalmatian went there from Rome not long after his baptism. His mind was still under the influence of the strong impression made on him by the dramatic flight of his friend St. Melania to the monastic silences of the East, and he soon fell in with some young men of his own age, many of them friends of his childhood, whose imaginations were all powerfully influenced by the wonderful example of the Fathers of the Desert, of whose extraordinary vocation and marvelous lives rumors were then reaching Europe. Jerome's arrival seemed to give the impetus required to convert these dreams into reality. Each acted according to his own inspiration, some, choosing to live in community, organized small convents, others elected to live as anchorites and hid themselves in Alpine caves or fled to some abandoned islet in the Adriatic, while Jerome retired to his wild native country of Stridon and gave himself up to austerity and prayer. Not all persevered, but thus to Aquileia we can trace the earliest monastic movement in Europe.

When towards the end of the same fourth century the Empire was in chaos and six Emperors ruled its wide territories, Maximus, the tyrant of Spain decided to wrest the throne of Italy from the feeble Valentinian by the help of his fierce Gauls and Germans. The young Emperor and his mother took refuge in Aquileia and thence sailed to beg the help of the great Theodosius, who ruled in the East. The march of the usurper was blocked by the bold stand of the little city of Armona on the confines of Italy, and when the army of Theodosius came against him he was no further than Pannonia, where he had fixed his camp near Siscia (the modern Sisek, in Croatia), strongly fortified by the broad and rapid stream of the Save. Even this protection, however, was not enough against the rapid Tartar tactics of the army of the East. After their long march, made in the heat of summer, the cavalry of Theodosius spurred their horses into the waters of the Save, swam the river in the presence of the enemy, and instantly charged and routed the troops who were guarding the high ground on the opposite side. Deserted by the surviving remnant of his army, Maximus fled south, and took refuge within the walls of Aquileia. Thither Theodosius followed him without delay, bringing his victorious army before the city

with incredible speed. Defended with sincerity neither by army nor populace, Maximus was soon dragged from the throne he had assumed, stripped of his purple, and brought out of the city to the camp of the Emperor, where he was put to death by the soldiers. The young Valentinian was restored to the throne, and when he in his turn was murdered by the Frankish leader Arbogastes, this new tyrant put the rhetorician Eugenius on the throne as nominal ruler. Theodosius was once again drawn to the West to fight the new usurper, and once again the struggle was fought in the neighborhood of Aquileia. There, when victory seemed almost in the grasp of the barbarians, the disloyalty of their supporters, aided by a furious storm, which seemed a bad omen and weakened their confidence, snatched it from them and united East and West under the rule of Theodosius.

That one-day battle (September 5, 394) had profound effect on the history of Christianity in Europe, for a victory of Eugenius would have meant a restoration of the cult of the ancient gods. This upstart emperor had received Christian baptism, but ambition led him to join the powerful heathen party. He gave back to the temples the property confiscated from them, took part in idol worship, and set up again the altar of victory in the Senate Chamber, while his praetorian prefect Flavian had re-opened the Roman temples, restored the high mysteries of Cybele, led himself the procession of Isis, and dazzled the citizens by the Oriental splendor of the rites of Mithra. Only a few months of life remained to the great Emperor, but it was sufficient to accomplish his desire of leaving a Christian Empire behind him. As ruler of the East he had been given an inexorable enemy of heresy, and it was left to him to dethrone, too, the deadlier spectre of paganism in the Roman world. His predecessor, Gratian, had been the first emperor who refused the historic office of Pontifex Maximus, but the official religion of the State was still pagan. According, therefore, to the forms of the Republic, Theodosius proposed in a full meeting of the Senate the momentous question whether the worship of Jupiter or that of Christ should be the religion of the Romans. Though outwardly the religion of the majority of the senators was pagan, still the Emperor's influence and example were strong, and the prestige which his championship of the true faith bestowed on it enough to overcome the force of age-long traditions. A large majority won the official recognition of Christianity, and this was followed by a great number of conversions among the leading patrician families. The Bassi, the Paulini, the Gracchi, embraced the Christian religion, the temples were defaced and the gods of antiquity were dragged in triumph at the chariot wheels of Theodosius.

With the victory of Christianity the importance of the See of Aquileia steadily increased. For many years now its occupants, acknowledged as the premier archbishops in the world, ruled a large and constantly extending body of faithful, and the position of the city in the Church was equal to its dignity in the Empire. But the glory of the city was soon to end. With the death of Theodosius the Roman Empire was again divided, and while disunion sapped the strength of the two divisions the barbarian nations established themselves on the frontier provinces of the East and West. One more usurper was to die in Aquileia before the glory of the ancient city should fade. While the throne of the Western Empire was as yet unoccupied after the death of the son of Theodosius, it was seized by a confidential secretary named John, to whom Italy readily submitted. The armies of the East advanced, and again Aquileia was chosen by the pretender for his place of defense. Here, however, his forces were conquered, and the usurper, led through the streets on an ass, exposed to the derision of those whom he aspired to rule, was then put to death in the arena.

The fall of the greatest Empire that the world has ever known was now in sight. The old Roman valor was dead, and the Emperor's armies had quailed before the might of the advancing hordes of Goths and Vandals. The Huns came in their turn and displaced these, and spread from the Volga to the Danube before discord weakened the power of their leaders. Then came Attila, who gloried in the name of the "Scourge of God," and the Huns once more became the terror of the world. Advancing into Italy by way of Dalmatia and Istria, Attila conquered and destroyed all the cities on his route, among them Spalatro, Salona, Trau, Sebenico, Zara, Pola, Parenzo, Capodistria, Trieste. Thousands of the inhabitants of these desolated cities fled before him and took refuge in Aquileia, in the strength of whose defenses they all trusted, and it was now the only barrier that delayed his conquest of Italy. Called upon to deliver up the fugitives, the city bravely refused and Attila advanced to the attack. For three months the siege continued, till the lack of provisions and the dissatisfaction of his army forced Attila to decide on retreat. However, the story goes that as he rode around the walls on the last night he saw a stork abandoning its nest in one of the towers and flying towards the country. Using, with the skill of a shrewd leader, this chance circumstance to play on the minds of his soldiers, he exclaimed that success was in sight, for so well domesticated a bird would not leave the city did she not feel the advent of ruin and solitude. Heartened by the omen a fresh attack was made and a breach forced in the wall near the point where the stork had been seen. "Then," says Gibbon, "the

Huns mounted to the assault with irresistible fury ; and the succeeding generation could scarcely discover the ruins of Aquileia."

Later writers find it hard to imagine how this huge city with its massive marble edifices should be so speedily destroyed utterly, while Rome was still magnificent even after the barbarians had more than once ravaged it, and preserved much of its splendor even to the days of Charlemagne. The truth is that the destruction of the city by the barbarians was only the beginning of Aquileia's decay, and successive invasions completed the ruin. In that attack more than 37,000 inhabitants are said to have lost their lives, and the rest scattered over the surrounding country far from their ruined homes. It was then that the islands of the lagoon became the resorts of fugitives from the shore. Gradus, or Grado, harbored many from Aquileia and the neighborhood, while many also mixed with the flying population from Padua, who took refuge in Rivus Altus, or Rialto, the chief island of the future Venice. To the trading traditions of these two parent cities many trace the phenomenal commercial success of the Venetians. Aquileia had had considerable commerce with Pannonia, and its merchandise went by the Danube as far as the Black Sea. Padua supplied Rome with manufactured stuffs. Together they received the productions of the whole Adriatic coast. They contributed, henceforth, to the growth of a great city and the development of a great state, but the glory of Aquileia was dead.

When some of the scattered citizens crept back to the desolated city it was no longer on the business of a great metropolis, but on a bare sustenance that their hopes were centred. With no shielding hand from Rome the city could not aspire again to its former position. Like Rome its situation was unhealthy, and now, with no large revenues to spend on the maintenance of its irrigatory canals, the fever-laden mists began to hang once more over the marshes, and the population dwindled rather than increased. Barbarian incursions came repeatedly, and no defenses could be erected, and none could cultivate in security the lands about the city. Gradually the abandoned buildings fell into decay and what remained were destroyed to supply materials for the rude houses of those who lingered.

The Church of Aquileia still struggled on. Its bishopric had, indeed, as years went by acquired a new importance, for the city, even in its decay, still commanded a certain amount of respect as a centre of Roman civilization among the Ostrogoths and Lombards who then held the North, and so the Bishops obtained from their barbarian rulers the honorary title of patriarch on the model of the great Christian cities of the East. It carried with it, how-

ever, none of the power connected with the name, and was in fact merely personal to each titular of the see—nor was it ratified as yet by Rome. Soon, in fact, the title proved a real danger. Illyricum had long been a bone of contention in the quarrel about metropolitan jurisdiction between the patriarchates of Rome and Constantinople, and now Aquileia on the frontier, relying to a large extent on the fictitious importance of its assumed title, made a claim to complete independence of either Rome or Constantinople, a claim that of course the Popes refused to listen to in any form. The break, however, came at length, occasioned by the celebrated quarrel of "The Three Chapters." Various Bishops held different views regarding the condemnation of certain writings which the Emperor Justinian wished to have declared heretical, and when Pope Vigilius followed the Bishops of the East in condemning, then a number of Bishops of northern Italy, lead by Macedonius of Aquileia, withdrew from the Roman communion in 553. Thus began a long schism.

Within a few years the inhabitants of the city had to fly again, this time before Alboin, who sacked the city once more. During this time of stress the patriarch took refuge in the neighboring island of Grado, which still remained imperial territory, and here succeeding patriarchs continued to reside. For fifty years the schism continued, and then in the first years of the seventh century the metropolitan Candidian, with those of his suffragans whose sees were within the Empire, submitted to the Holy See. His suffragans, however, among the Lombards still refused to submit, and restored the old see at Aquileia as a schismatical patriarchate. This double line continued for almost a century, during which time the Popes seem to have recognized, or at least tolerated, the title of Patriarch of Aquileia as held by the metropolitans of Grado, as an offset to its assumption by the schismatic Bishops of "Old Aquileia." In 700 the synod of Old Aquileia closed the schism, but the two patriarchates continued.

The patriarch who resided at Grado now took his title from that city, and the patriarch of Old Aquileia saw his diocese gradually decreasing in importance. After years of rule by the Dukes of Friuli; the city once more came under imperial sway during the reign of Charlemagne, and this emperor was called upon to arbitrate when its Bishop made one of the periodical protests at a further reduction of his metropolitan area. It was during the reign of Charlemagne, too, that St. Paulinus occupied the see, and brought it fresh lustre by his sanctity and his learning.

In the eleventh century the city became a feudal possession of its patriarch, but this new power brought trouble and frequent con-

flict to occupiers of the see. It was also in this century that there were consecrated two great cathedrals by the two patriarchs, that of Bamberg by John IV., with thirty Bishops, and in 1031 the Basilica of Aquileia, erected by one of the greatest of its patriarchs, Poppo. This great churchman did much to revive some of the former dignity of the see. A nobleman and a distinguished warrior before he entered the service of the Church, he was high in favor with the ruling Emperor, and his oratorical powers served him well in those councils in which the rights of his archdiocese were considered. His special aim was to force the rival patriarchate of Grado to submit to his metropolitan jurisdiction, and thus terminate the rivalry that existed between them. The means by which he secured his end seems to us questionable, for in open attack Grado was captured and its treasure brought to Aquileia. Still local historians, lay and ecclesiastical, have approved his action, and the result was confirmed by Pope John XIX, who subordinated the See of Grado to that of Aquileia. A few years later, however, we find this decision revoked and Grado declared once more independent.

As Lord of Aquileia, Poppo's interests were not solely confined to Church matters. He wished to make the city worthy of the patriarchal dignity, and did much to improve the lot of the inhabitants. He promoted commerce with the neighboring people, made new roads, and, to revive the appearance of a city as well as to strengthen the position, built new walls and fortifications. The Emperor Conrad II. gave him sovereign power over Friuli and Istria and jurisdiction over the marches of Verona, with permission to coin silver money and other favors that raised him to the level of a prince of the Empire. In return the Emperor demanded that he and his successors on the imperial throne should be made members of the Cathedral Chapter—an arrangement which secured that the Emperor would have considerable influence in the election of future patriarchs, the result in fact being that for two centuries the patriarchs with only one exception were all German.

Dependence of the Imperial power was further strengthened by the envy of Venice, which the extension of the patriarchal dominion aroused, and the consequent necessity of defense by the imperial patrons. During his lifetime Poppo combined in a singularly easy manner the dignities of ecclesiastical governor and feudal lord. We find him taking part in many military operations both offensive and defensive, and his fame extended far and wide. He brought the patriarchate to the highest point of its ecclesiastical and civil power, but it was largely through the force of his own personality and influence, so that after his death it soon began to diminish in importance once again.

When the dignity of the old city could not be maintained the succeeding patriarchs several times changed their place of residence—to Cormons, to Cividale and Udine, in which last city they resided permanently after the destruction of Aquileia by an earthquake in 1348. From that time they were to all practical intents metropolitans of Udine. With the transfer in 1451 of the Patriarchate of Grado to the flourishing city of Venice, the rival see lost considerably in prestige. Its imperial tendencies, too, were not pleasing to the Venetians, and for many years the powerful republic rendered the occupancy of the neighboring patriarchate a position of extreme difficulty. When Venice and Hungary were at war in the early fifteenth century the Venetians found an excuse to seize on the lands of the patriarchate, and henceforth the see came entirely under the power of Venice, and was never occupied but by a Venetian. The patriarch's territory was extended after some years to include Austrian Friuli and consequently some Austrian dioceses.

So matters remained until the eighteenth century, when the Venetian claim to the nomination of Patriarch was met with equal plausibility by a claim of the same right by Austria. The matter was left to the arbitration of the Holy See, who merged the patriarchate in that of Venice and finally divided the whole territory of the Patriarch of Aquileia into two archdioceses, one at Udine with Venetian Friuli for its territory, the other at Görz with jurisdiction over Austrian Friuli. A few relics of the old patriarchate remain. The Archbishop of Udine has a right to the Cardinal's scarlet robes, the deacon in High Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany in Cividale wears a helmet and steel corselet and carries a sword to symbolize the ancient temporal power, and there remains the old patriarchal Basilica of Aquileia, which is now immediately subject to the Holy See and whose rector has a right to the episcopal insignia seven times a year.

The glory of Aquileia is therefore completely gone. A small unhealthy village of a few hundred inhabitants is all that remains of the once great city with its temples, its palaces and its theatres. The Empress Maria Theresa, to whom is chiefly due the settlement of the discord between the two patriarchates, extended her care also to the town and had fresh attempts begun to drain the marshes. These works were continued after her death until they were put an end to suddenly by the political events of 1790, and since then nothing had been done. During the French occupation Eugene Beauparnais interested himself in the city's past and encouraged the excavations which had begun, but no further attempt was made to give life to the shade of the ancient city. A few carved stones set here and there in the rough masonry of cottage walls remind us

of the glory that once was there and a museum containing many memorials of the past serves only to accentuate the utter destruction of all its greatness. The one tie with the past is the Basilica. This links us back with the fourth century Church of St. Fortunatus, for it may be justly regarded as merely the old church restored. Excavations have brought to light several feet below the present surface the floor of the original building and now one descends several steps on entering the church and kneels again on the ancient mosaics where the early Christians knelt in the days of Aquileia's glory. The baptistery and the porch are also relics of the past, and the crypt with its old Roman lamps is, according to tradition, the actual cell in which the first Bishop, St. Hermagoras, was imprisoned before his martyrdom. No less remarkable a link is the campanile which rises solitary, a few yards distant from the church. It is as old as we reckon, but modern when we consider the ages that Aquileia knew. Still it connects us closely with far distant years, for it is built of stone blocks taken from the old amphitheatre. Nothing seemed more fitting to its builders than that the stones which were empurpled by the blood of countless martyrs of Aquileia should form part of the sacred edifice where its future sons would worship.

Looking at this venerable building, noble in its simplicity, standing almost alone amid desolation that is pathetic, the same thoughts come to the traveler as when he wanders through the streets of Rome and sees every monument of ancient glory stamped with the name of some Pope as its restorer. "*Eterna città sei grande pei tuoi pontefici*"—"Eternal city, thou art great through thy Pontiffs" is true in more than one sense. If the Popes had not preserved what remained of the ancient splendors of Rome, nothing but the memory of the greatest city in the olden world would now remain. In Aquileia it is the same. Were it not for the patriarchate and the city's importance as an ecclesiastical centre, every vestige of the city would have disappeared centuries ago. It was through the energies of its ecclesiastical lords that it was again and again rebuilt and that the little that had remained from former years was saved. Whatever now remains is preserved for us by the Church. The might of the Roman Republic, the splendor of the Empire passed away but the Church continues down the ages. Heir to what was best in its culture, it first purified the old Roman state from its worst horrors and then superseded it as, apart from its supernatural mission, the greatest force in the world of man. The Eternal City is with us still, the old Rome merged into the new. Aquileia is gone, but its church, the one link with the past, is symbolic. The tiny spark of faith that peered through the gloom of sin, the magnifi-

cence, the debauchery, the utter worldliness of the old order of things grew into a great fire—from the ashes of paganism rose resplendent the glorious City of God.

THOMAS F. RYAN, S. J., M. A.

Dublin, Ireland.

MODERNISM IN THE LAW.

WHEN Rousseau first applied the term "modernist" to an atheistical philosopher of his own day, he could not have expected that it would later become the name for a whole school of thought—it can scarcely be called a system of philosophy—to be designated and denounced by Papal decree as "the synthesis of all heresies." It is true, however, that after more than a century of fluctuating definitions, the words "modernist" and "modernism" have reverted to the original meaning given them by the French radical, so that to-day they signify practically atheism in some one of its protean forms. After having fallen into disuse or been forgotten, these terms were revived by the Catholic publicist, Périn of Louvain, about the year 1878, and were used by him in the sense in which they are now understood by all Catholics. By whatever name modernity has been known in its varying manifestations—whether as liberalism, rationalism, materialism, intellectualism, secularism or paganism—it has embraced the same general teachings and tendencies, and always and everywhere it has met with the earnest opposition of the Church, finally receiving its definite denunciation by Pius X. in the Encyclical "Pascendi," in 1907. Its devastating doctrines have had certain beneficial reactions, compensating to some extent its evil effects. For instance, Newman, in his hostility to "liberalism," was led to inaugurate the movement that finally brought him back to Rome. Upon his induction into the Anglican ministry, in 1828, he conceived that his mission in life was to combat the modernist cult, and all through his work and writings this sentiment gave consistency and continuity to his thought and labor. It may confidently be asserted that the same sentiment that induced the great English convert and Cardinal to begin the inquiries that eventually made him a Catholic, has been responsible for a majority of the conversions to the faith in recent times, among the educated and thinking men of all countries. Sincere patriots, philosophers and reformers, the world over, like Newman, have witnessed with increasing fear "the tide of widespread infidelity rising like a deluge," and have beheld in prospect the time "when only the tops of the mountains will be seen like islands in the waste of waters."¹ Most of them, too, like him, have arrived at the conclusion that "there is no medium, in true philosophy, between atheism and Catholicity, and that a perfectly consistent mind, in those circumstances in which it finds itself here

¹ Ward's "Life of Newman," Vol. II., p. 416.

below, must embrace either the one or the other."² Another great Catholic teacher of our day has forcibly delineated the origin and development of the modernist movement, and has clearly identified its doctrines and destined effects with the logical and ultimate consequences of the Protestant propaganda. Concluding his argument on the purely religious aspect of the subject, he says: "Left to itself and if it does react against its own principles, Protestantism cannot be other than an instrument of dissolution. . . . If you believe that dogma is subject to change; that religious knowledge is purely subjective or symbolical; that it is subject to every contingency, both present and future, of private interpretation; then you are no longer Christian."³

The foundation principle of modernism is the repudiation of all ultramundane or supernatural sources and standards of knowledge and authority in religion, morals and social ethics. By a perfectly natural and logical process of evolution, it leads to the repudiation of any sane and stable source and standard of truth and authority in whatsoever matter of human concern may enlist the effort and aspiration of mankind; and so it has demonstrated itself, with rapid and ruthless progress, during the last century and especially during the last fifty years. The manifestations of the movement are fairly well known to most observant laymen in their every-day lives and experiences, but, owing to the technical nature of the subject, the manner and degree in which modernistic teachings and tendencies have affected the law have escaped general notice and discussion. The divarication from sound and sacred precedents and principles has been as marked and menacing in the field of legal and judicial opinion as in any other domain, and the importance of this departure to society and government **demand**s that greater heed be paid to its ravages.

In examining the illustrations of the modernistic tendency in the law, greater stress is to be placed upon the English than upon the American decisions, for obvious reasons. From the earliest times in Britain, Church and State, religion and law, have been intimately related. The whole fabric of her civilization was laid on Christian foundations, and for the first fourteen centuries of her national development it was the spirit and the genius of the Church, acting and speaking through illustrious Catholic warriors, statesmen, ecclesiastics, and lawyers, that won the liberties, framed the institutions, and moulded at once the intellect and the character of the English people. The English Constitution, so

² "Apologia pro Vita Sua," p. 198.

³ Baudrillart, "The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism," pp. 325-326.

vaunted for its wisdom and durability, was distinctly the fruitage of Catholicism in its full vigor and virtue; its symmetry was achieved under Catholic tutelage, and its growth ended with the destruction of Catholic dominion over the nation's mind and conscience. That magnificent structure of jurisprudence that justifies the pride of Britons everywhere and has been a model and inspiration to half the world, and especially its chief glory—the system of enlightened equity that tempers the harsh rigors of the law to the spirit of substantial justice—were the bright, particular product of the ecclesiastical tribunals under the rule of the Church. These facts of history may be read, “line upon line and precept upon precept,” in the pages of every authentic writer of British annals—Hallam, Stubbs, Delolme, Freeman, Bagehot, May, Macaulay and Hume all bear witness to their truth. After the “Reformation,” in the sixteenth century, British institutions passed into Protestant hands, with a close union of the secular and sacred jurisdictions, and thenceforth the British government presents, in concrete form and unrestrained operation, the new spirit that has animated the conscience and interpreted the laws of the realm.

In America the situation has been wholly different. Except for the irregular conditions of the Colonial period, this republic has always maintained a rigid separation of religion and law, both by federal and by State enactments, so that it is only rarely and incidentally that any question of religious rights and doctrines comes before the American courts. This is not to say, however, that the United States has escaped the influences that tend to sterilize the national sentiment of all religious feeling, and to banish from our institutions those Christian principles that gave them birth, and aforesaid commanded the reverence and loyalty of American patriots. It is being done with us in a more subtle and sinister way than in the courts of the country. The attack is being made through legislative and social activities and “reforms”; through constitutional innovations; through the secularization of education; through the socialization of industry and enterprise, the multiplication of governmental functions, the extension of the police powers of the State, the invasion of individual and domestic rights; in short, through all the devices and usurpations of a mischievous materialism, originating and enforcing new forms of arbitrary and artificial tyranny by the domination of popular majorities. In time and insensibly the courts, too, will respond to the same insidious sophistry that latterly has won over the English judiciary to renounce its ancient decrees, and the genesis of the defection, here as there, will be found in the necessary implications of Protestantism.

The Treaty of Augsburg (1555) and that of Westphalia (1648)

marked the beginning and the culmination of the politico-religious doctrine upon which European Protestantism based its system of belief and practice, namely, that "the religion of the ruler shall be the religion of the land" (*cujus regio, illius religio*). Henry VIII. had put into actual operation the same ideal in the first half of the sixteenth century, and Elizabeth consummated the subordination of the Church to the State. Translated into general terms, this principle predicated its validity upon the right of the ruling power, whether a monarch or a mob, an autocracy or a democracy, to ordain and enforce whatever religious system might accord with the caprice or the fanaticism of the time and place, thus rendering the whole matter one of temporal and fluctuating contingencies, the sport or the spoil of social and political changes. Such a doctrine necessarily contains within itself the ultimate destruction of all religious order whatsoever, and this was recognized very early in the development of the doctrine in its practical application to the law. In 1601 a statute was enacted known as the law of "charitable uses," in which no mention was made of religion as such a use.⁴ Commenting on this law, Sir Francis Moore, an eminent legal authority of that era, said that the omission was intentional, because, as he explained, gifts or grants of land to religious purposes might lead to escheats under the "chantries act,"⁵ for, he says, "religion being variable, according to the pleasure of the prince, that which at one time is held for orthodox may at another be accounted superstitious, and then such lands would be confiscate."⁶

So well, however, had the Church done her work of piety and culture in England during the centuries before the Tudors rejected the ancient faith of the people, that not even the revolutionary tyranny of those sovereigns, nor the devious methods of subsequent proscriptions and persecutions, could eradicate from the popular mind or from the canons of English jurisprudence the fundamental dogmas of true Christianity. For the next three hundred years the old faith continued to write its holy precepts in the acts of Parliaments and the judgments of courts, while its sway was still dominant in the inner consciousness of the nation. Under the imported Puritanism of William of Orange it was enacted that it should be *blasphemy* and punishable as a felony for any person, educated as a Christian or professing Christianity, "to deny any One of the Persons of the Holy Trinity to be God, or that there is only One God, or that the Christian religion is true, or that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are of divine authority."⁷ That

⁴ 43 Eliz., chap. 4.

⁵ Edw. VI., chap. 14.

⁶ Duke, "Charitable Uses," 131, 382.

⁷ 9 and 10 Wm. III., chap. 32.

was in 1698, and it is the statute law of England to-day, although overturned by the later decisions of the courts according to the latitudinous interpretation characteristic of the Protestant method. In 1813 an amendment of this law was adopted, excepting Unitarians from its penalties,⁸ which legislation was in itself a recognition of the validity of the older statute. Blasphemy has always been a criminal offense under the common law of England and her colonies and dominions, as well as in the United States. It is treated as a libel against the Almighty, upon the same principle that obtained under the Mosaic code, by whose provisions it was also high treason against the Theocracy. The statute of 1698 was thus merely declaratory and confirmative of the *lex non scripta* that had prevailed since the advent of Christianity in Britain and the formation of the common law. Blackstone defines blasphemy as "denying the being or providence of God, contumelious reproaches of Our Saviour Christ, profane scoffing at the Holy Scripture or exposing it to ridicule."⁹ Chancellor Kent, the American commentator, describes it as "maliciously reviling God and religion,"¹⁰ while the Supreme Court of Massachusetts has declared that it is "speaking evil of the Deity, with an impious purpose to derogate from the Divine Majesty and to alienate the minds of others from the love and reverence of God."¹¹

In all of these definitions the gist and gravamen of the crime lie in the attack upon the Christian faith and the denial of those fundamental dogmas that are inculcated by the Church; as one writer says, its criminality consists in the fact that "it is *lèse majesté* divine." There is no suggestion or implication that the offense derives its wrongful quality from any breach of individual rights or of the public peace. Of course the law regards the consequential evils of impiety and atheism as affecting those principles and institutions that have their sanction in the doctrines of Christianity, so that, as under the Jewish law, there is a species of treason in uttering blasphemous words against the Christian faith. There may also, in certain instances, be a grave affront to personal security and comfort in attacking the most sacred sentiments men can entertain. But these are secondary considerations. The logical and legal nature of blasphemy is its religious culpability as a libel against Christian dogmas and authority; its criminality postulates a belief in the truth and validity of the faith as it was delivered to the saints. If that aspect of the law be ignored or rejected and guilt is made to depend upon the time, place and circumstances of

⁸ 53 Geo. III., chap. 160.

⁹ 4 Bl. Com. 59.

¹⁰ *People v. Ruggles*, 8 Johns. 293-8.

¹¹ *Com. v. Kneeland*, 20 Pick. 213, 220.

the utterances, or upon the hurt done to the feelings of others, or as tending to provoke a breach of the peace, the offense becomes no graver than any other infraction of personal rights or violation of police regulations, such as legal nuisances in general.

There was never any serious question as to this being the correct view of the law until during the last century, and the English tribunals never advanced a contrary opinion until within the last fifty years. Prior to the "Reformation" such questions were cognizable in the ecclesiastical courts, where, of course, there could be but one view of the matter. The first reported case after the law courts assumed jurisdiction was that of *Rex v. Taylor*, in 1675, in which Lord Hale said that "although blasphemy is of ecclesiastical cognizance, it is not only an offense against God and religion, but a crime against the laws, State and government, because it tends to dissolve all those obligations whereby civil society is preserved."¹² This, which includes both the religious and the secular character of the crime, became the ruling principle of all subsequent decisions until recently denied.

In 1797 Paine's "Age of Reason" was adjudged to be a blasphemous publication, Lord Kenyon saying: "This publication is horrible to Christian ears."¹³ It had already, in 1754, been held by Lord Hardwicke that a will bequeathing a fund to maintain the study and propagation of Judaism was invalid, as tending to attack Christianity, and this notwithstanding the Act of Toleration.¹⁴ In 1819 Lord Eldon said: "I apprehend that it is the duty of every judge presiding in an English court of justice, when he is told that there is no difference between worshiping the Supreme Being in chapel, church or synagogue, to recollect that Christianity is a part of the law of England."¹⁵ In 1822, as Lord Chancellor, he decided that certain lectures published by the College of Surgeons, in which the immortality of the soul was questioned and the authority of the Scriptures denied, were contrary to Christianity and not entitled to protection in a court of equity.¹⁶ Again Lord Eldon refused to protect the copyright in Byron's poem "Cain," for the same reason, namely, that it was an attack upon the Christian religion.¹⁷ His decision appears in the preface to Byron's works published in 1846.

The poet Shelley likewise fell under the ban of the law against blasphemy. He was expelled from Oxford in 1811 for being the author of a pamphlet entitled "The Necessity of Atheism," and in 1840, nearly twenty years after his death, Edward Moxon, the pub-

¹² 1 Vert. 293.

¹³ *Rex v. Williams*, 26 How. St. Tr. 653.

¹⁴ *De Costa v. De Paz*, 2 Swanst. 487-8.

¹⁵ *In re Bedford Charity*, 2 Swanst. 479.

¹⁶ *Lawrence v. Smith*, 3 Jac. 471.

¹⁷ *Murray v. Benbow*, 3 Jac. 474, note.

lisher of his works, was indicted and convicted of blasphemy in thus uttering and circulating "a scandalous, impious, profane and malicious libel of and concerning the Holy Scriptures, and of and concerning Almighty God."¹⁸ Moxon was defended by Sir Thomas Talfourd, himself a poet of renown as the author of "Ion," as well as a brilliant orator. Talfourd's speech to the jury is a literary gem and a legal curiosity, containing as it does, clothed in every allurements of rhetoric, the sophisticated plea for intellectual freedom and social progress that is the soul of modernism, and which has finally triumphed in the judicial tribunals.¹⁹ A few years before this (1833) Lord Macaulay, in a speech in Parliament on the bill to remove Jewish disabilities, had voiced similar sentiments, saying: "I think it wrong to punish a man for selling Paine's 'Age of Reason' in a back shop to those who choose to buy, or for delivering a deistical lecture in a private room to those who choose to listen"; and he proceeds to argue that publicity and an offense against the private feelings of the religious, tending to a disturbance of the peace, are essential to the crime of blasphemy, likening it to a slaughter-house in a residential district, or to an indecent exposure of the person on the highway.²⁰ Thus we discover the insidious beginnings of that line of reasoning so popular among the "intellectuals" and recently characteristic of the Anglican aristocracy, that obliterates religious faith as being in itself valid, and transforms blasphemy into a secular nuisance, hurtful to persons or to the public, rather than a libel against God and a treason to Christian civilization. But it required some years yet before this view was adopted by the courts.

In 1850 the judges held invalid, as being intended to promote a blasphemous purpose, a legacy for "the best original essay on natural theology, treating it as a science and demonstrating it to be a true, perfect and philosophical system of universal religion, analogous to other universal systems of science, like astronomy, etc." The court did not even discuss the question, Sir Launcelot Shadwell, J., simply saying: "I cannot conceive that the bequest is at all consistent with Christianity."²¹ The leading case of *Cowan v. Milbourn* was decided in 1867, in which it was held to be immoral and illegal to contract to rent a hall for the delivery of lectures by the Secular Society upon their advanced views of religion, especially to the effect that the Bible is no more inspired than any other book, and "The Teachings and Character of Christ; the Former Misleading and the Latter Defective." The court, by Kelly, C. B.,

¹⁸ *Reg. v. Moxon*, 4 St. Tr. N. S. 693.

¹⁹ Select "Orations," edited by Hazeltine. Vol. XI, pp. 5216-30.

²⁰ *Speeches*, Vol. I, pp. 114-125, (Vol. XVI, Complete Writings, 1900 Ed.)

²¹ *Briggs v. Hartley*, 19 L. J. Ch. 416.

said that "Christianity is a part and parcel of the common law of the land," and that the proposed lectures were a propaganda of a blasphemous and prohibited nature.²²

The next few years witnessed a startling and radical change in the judicial attitude, due to the gradual growth of rationalism and of the agnosticism of such leaders as Spencer and Huxley, to say nothing of the rabid atheism of men like Charles Bradlaugh. In 1883, Bradlaugh, Ramsay and Foote were jointly indicted for publishing articles in "The Freethinker" asserting that God, as depicted in the Bible, is a cruel and heartless despot; that the whole tenor of the Scripture is improbable, irrational and false, disproving its own inspiration.²³ The defendant Foote took the bold ground that blasphemy is but a new name for the old offense of heresy, and ceased to be cognizable at law with the extinction of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, noted for his violent anti-Catholic prejudices, as was shown in the trial of Cardinal Newman in the famous Achilli libel case in 1853, held that no offense had been committed by these publications, unless they were in themselves or in the manner of their circulation indecent and calculated to provoke a breach of the peace. He said: "If the decencies of controversy are observed, even the fundamentals of religion may be attacked without the writer being guilty of blasphemy." This was equivalent to saying that the whole subject of religious belief or unbelief is open to controversy, placed Christianity upon the same footing as any other creed or no creed at all, and completely reversed the decisions of the law courts from the days of Lord Hale and of the ecclesiastical courts from the time of Edward the Confessor. Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, than whom England has produced no abler law writer in modern times, forcibly attacked Lord Coleridge's view, arguing that blasphemy consists in the matter and not in the manner of its utterance, which is obvious from the very nature of the crime.²⁴ In 1915, in the case of *Re Bowman*,²⁵ the new doctrine was carried to its full effect. Property had been devised to the Secular Society of London in trust, to promote the following named purposes: "That human conduct should be governed by natural knowledge and not by supernatural authority or belief; that human welfare on earth is the proper end of all thought and action; that all forms of religion should be denied recognition by the government and no support thereto ever be allowed; that all education should be strictly secular and no religious teaching ever be allowed in the public schools; that marriage

²² 36 L. J. Exch. N. S. 124.

²³ *Reg. v. Ramsay et al.*, 48 L. T. R. 733.

²⁴ "History of Criminal Law," Vol. II., pp. 449-476.

²⁵ 113 L. T. R., 1095.

be made purely a civil contract; that Sunday be recognized only as a civil institution for rest and recreation; and to establish propaganda for these purposes, by lectures, books, pecuniary aid, and use of property granted or devised to the Society." This, it will be observed, is a fairly clear and comprehensive statement of the aims and doctrines of modernism, in whatever form it appears, and the British court held them to be legal, even commendable. Lord Cozens-Hardy, delivering the opinion, said: "It is to my mind almost shocking that the publications of positivists, who do not admit, and possibly deny, the existence of a God, are necessarily blasphemous. I think the older view must now be considered obsolete." Again: "This is one of the subjects on which there have undoubtedly been great changes of opinion with the last one hundred years, and I think within the last half century. It is really a question of public policy which varies from time to time." This was but to repeat the words of Sir Francis Moore in the sixteenth century, before quoted, when Protestantism was in its infancy and its essential implications were understood by the men who saw its birth. But what becomes of the long line of judicial and legislative precedents, from the inception of the law courts of the realm, sanctioned by such wisdom and piety as were illustrated in the utterances of Hale and Hardwicke, Kenyon and Eldon?

The Bowman case went to the House of Lords on appeal, in 1917, where the decision of the lower court as above cited was affirmed by a majority of the judges and approved by the House.²⁶ It is not recorded what view the "lords spiritual" of the "church by law established" entertained upon a subject so vital to their religious system, but some of them undoubtedly were present and there was no voice of protest from the worshipful bishops and archbishops. Lords Dunedin, Buckmaster and Sumner delivered the majority decision in separate opinions, while the lord chancellor, Lord Finlay, dissented in a remarkably able protest against the abandonment of England's historical attitude towards Christianity and religion. The cases of *Briggs v. Hartley* and *Cowan v. Milbourn*, *supra*, were expressly overruled, as they had been below, and blasphemy as a religious libel was abolished in favor of the general law of nuisances as applied to the subject, thus secularizing and paganizing the whole field of religious belief. Lord Dunedin said that the statements contained in the former decisions, to the effect that "Christianity is a part of the common law of England," were mere *dicta* and entitled to no serious consideration in this age; that to constitute blasphemy there must be "an element of vilification, ridicule or irreverence, likely to exasperate the feelings of

²⁶ 117 L. T. R., 161.

others and lead to a breach of the peace;" and then he paradoxically remarks that "anti-Christian writings are all the more insidious and effective for being couched in decorous terms." He did not explain how, when all reverence for Christian truth is lost or repudiated, vilification or ridicule thereof can reasonably be held to constitute exasperation, or provocation to disorder. Lord Buckmaster gave expression to the ingenious, if amusing, generalization, that "natural religion, being arrived at by human reason, which is a faculty bestowed upon man by Divine power, is therefore *pro tanto* a Divine form of religion." *Ergo*, whatever may be said to be the result of any faculty bestowed upon man by the Creator, is *pro tanto* divine, although instigated by the basest of passions and issuing in the most diabolical consequences. He further said that in his opinion the common law did not render criminal the propagation of anti-Christian or irreligious doctrines, but that the criminality depends upon the manner in which the doctrines are disseminated.

In the trial of the case in the lower court, Pickford, J., had delivered the following *dictum*, which the House of Lords now approved: "I think there is no doubt that in former times such an object (that of the Secular Society) would have been held contrary to public policy, but the question is whether it is right to hold so now. I think that the doctrine of public policy cannot be considered as being always the same, and that many things would be and have been held contrary to public policy in the past which are not so held now;" a proposition not to be controverted, provided, that the truths and authority of the Christian religion are to be reduced to the level of mere public policy. All of the judges admitted that they were going "counter to what has been said by judges of great authority in past generations," but they did not therefore hesitate to declare the old faith dead and the old law obsolete in England. The arguments of the learned lords are labored and inconclusive, but as logical expositions of the results to which the Protestant theory of religion has led the English courts, nothing could be more admirable and convincing. To the same conclusion must the theory ever arrive, and the process was so long delayed in England solely because of the residuum of Catholic Faith that the "Reformation" was not able to obliterate from the minds and hearts of the English people. The American courts, for the reasons already stated, have not gone to the extent of repudiating Christianity as the foundation of our religious, social and political institutions, and it is not likely that they will soon have occasion to do so, under our present constitutional system of absolute neutrality towards all religious questions, so far as governmental recognition and support are concerned. The main prin-

ciples that have been adopted by our courts, State and Federal, may be summarized as follows: that fundamentally this is a religious and a Christian nation, recognizing in all its traditions, institutions and practices the doctrines of Christianity as the basis of our social system and political order; that no law of State or nation will ever be interpreted to accomplish an irreligious or un-Christian purpose; that the only God known to American polity and law is the God of the Old and New Testaments; that to revile the Christian faith and its Divine Founder is a crime by the common law of the land; that while all religions or the lack of any religion at all are to be tolerated, Christianity alone commands the position of embodying the principles and policies to which the American people as a whole are committed.²⁷ Most of the decisions cited are comparatively old cases, and it is hard to say how far some of our modern judges would go in holding to the same doctrines. The doctrines themselves were largely inherited from England, and the influence of the recent English decisions no doubt will make itself felt here. Public opinion and policy in the United States are more volatile than in any other country, and the voice of the populace is all powerful. It is absolutely certain that the paganizing forces that are at work in the public schools and universities, in social organizations, in literature and amusements, and in the numberless secular movements for ostensibly worthy ends, will eventually develop a spirit politic that must control the body politic and exhibit itself in the laws and judicial decisions.

There is no other earthly interest that can be so profoundly and disastrously affected by the teachings of modernism as the domain of government, whether viewed as a symmetrical system of political organization framed upon the fundamental principles of constitutionalism, or as administered in the detailed provisions of civil codes for the protection of personal and social rights. The law, in this comprehensive sense, is essentially a dogmatic science, and, as has been often pointed out, "dogma and supernatural knowledge are correlative terms; one implies the other, as the action implies the object." The dogmas of spiritual truth and the dogmas of secular sovereignty have the same source and authority, and their qualities are the same—unity, universality and stability. It is literally true that "of the law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world."²⁸ If dethroned from that sacred citadel and made the sport of frail and fluctuating human standards, it becomes the instrument

²⁷ *Holy Trinity Church v. U. S.*, 143 U. S. 472; *Vidal v. Girard*, 2 How. 198; *Updegraph v. Com.*, 11 Serg. and R. 394; *Com. v. Kneeland*, 20 Pick. 218; *People v. Ruggles*, 8 Johns. 289.

²⁸ Hooker, "The Law of Ecclesiastical Polity," Book 1.

of license or of despotism according as it is inspired by human cupidity or human ambition, and what was destined to secure harmony produces discord and dissolution. The soundness of this assertion is being demonstrated, as never before, in the present calamitous and chaotic condition of the world, and to this condition all of the tenets and tendencies of modernism inevitably lead. They are animated by the same futile purpose and the same delusive motto that inspired the paganism of antiquity, as its expiring gaze beheld the dawn of Christianity: *Sequere Naturam*. Meanwhile, and whatever befalls, the Church maintains her indefectible dogmas, undiminished and unchangeable: *Sedit et aeternum sedebit*.

DUDLEY G. WOOTEN.

Seattle, Wash.

THE CATHOLIC ORIGINS OF LATVIA.

ON AUGUST 22, 1920, in the Church of the Monastery of Alone, in Latgale (the former province of Vitebsk), Monsignor A. Springovich received episcopal consecration as the first Catholic Bishop of Latvia, and a native son of Latgale, having been born there in 1887. Dr. Springovich received his licentiate in theology at the Catholic Academy in Petrograd.

The ceremony of consecration was performed by Monsignor J. Skvirezkas, Bishop of Kovno (Lithuania), the Minister of the Interior and other civil and military authorities being in attendance.

Responding to those extending their kind wishes for his successful administration, Monsignor Springovich expressed genuine pride and pleasure because of his Lettish nationality, and undertook to nurture the spiritual welfare of his people with due regard for the requirements of national policy.¹

Latvia, the new Republic of the Baltic region, has among its people 60,000 Catholics. From the very beginning of Christianity in this region, Latgale, or Polish Livonia, had no Bishops, although episcopal sees were established at Riga, Dorpat, Reval, and other places. The history of Latvia for several centuries, from the twelfth to the sixteenth, is but one page of the history of the Catholic Church in Northern Europe. Catholicism has colored and endowed with vigor and life the national genius of the country. The popular songs of the earliest Lettish literature developed under the influence of the Catholic Church. Through the effort of Catholic missionaries, Latvia was opened to Western civilization. Her capital, Riga, was long an episcopal city. The region itself was under the rule of a military order, the Teutonic Knights. The historic past of Latvia is therefore intimately connected with the annals of Catholic apostleship, and if the fanaticism of the earliest Reformers, and the religious intolerance of Swedish Lutheranism and Russian Orthodoxy destroyed the last vestiges of Catholicism in Latvia, it is to be hoped that in a near future under a regime of freedom, it will be revived and contribute to the moral elevation of the country. Latvia is one of the republics that have arisen upon the ruins of Tsaristic Russia. She has an area of 63,000 square kilometers and a population of 2,000,000 inhabitants. Her territory borders that of Lithuania. It is not impossible that one day the two peoples will unite their destinies so as better to protect themselves against their more powerful and ambitious neighbors.

¹ Bulletin du ministère des affaires étrangères de Latvia, Riga, August 26, 1920.

The origin of Christianity in the Baltic provinces coincides with the foundation of the town of Lübeck in the year 1158.² The town soon became a great commercial centre between Germany and the inhabitants of the Baltic shores. Wisby, in the island of Gotland, which had played for centuries a rôle of great importance and an entrepôt on the trade routes from Scandinavia to Kiev, the Dnieper lands, and "Tsargrad" (Constantinople), now was called upon to play a new part in the trade and cultural relations between Western Europe and the Baltic peoples. In 1163, German colonists settled there. The town increased considerably. Its population may be estimated by the fact that the ruins of nearly ninety-one churches have been discovered. The chroniclers of Nizhni-Novgorod relate that a colony of Germans and another of the natives of Gotland were busy with commercial undertakings in their town. German goods were conveyed on German ships via the Narova and Neva Rivers. The products of Russia and the Baltic region were heaped high in the warehouses of Wisby, whence they were shipped to Germany.

The discovery of Livonia is due to the merchants of Lübeck, who ascended the Dwina to its mouth and entered into relations with the inhabitants along its banks. Following them, Catholic missionaries began to spread the light of the Gospel on the shores of the Baltic. The merit of having laid the foundation for the work of the Catholic Church in the region of Livonia, now known as the Republic of Latvia, belongs to a canon regular of St. Augustine, Meynard.

The life of this missionary, whom the Catholics of Latvia venerate as the earliest apostle of their race, has had no accurate historian, as is the case with St. Ansgar, the apostle of Scandinavia. He came from the monastery of Segeberg, in the duchy of Holstein. He expressed to the Archbishop of Bremen his earnest desire and religious purposes to accompany the German merchants carrying on trade between the island of Gotland and the Baltic provinces.³ At that time, these provinces were tributary to the Russian prince, Vladimir of Polotsk, who granted the zealous missionary a safe conduct. He received full faculties and a sincere blessing from the Archbishop of Bremen and landed in Livonia in 1184.⁴ His first residence was the village of Uxküll. Here he built an oratory and

² See F. Kruse: *Urgeschichte des Esthonischen Volksstammes und der Kaiserlich-Russischen Ostseeprovinzen Liv. Esth.-und Curland überhaupt bis zur Einführung der Christlichen Religion*, Leipzig, 1846; K. Schlözer, *Livland und die Anfänge deutschen Lebens im baltischen Norden*, Berlin, 1850. Th. Kallmeyer: *Die Begründung deutschen Herrschaft in Kurland Während des XIII. Jahrhunderts*, Riga, 1859.

³ G. Dehio: *Geschichte der Erzbistum Hamburg-Brema*, Berlin, 1877.

⁴ H. Vitte: *Disputatio historico-moralis de Meynardo primo Livonorum episcopo et conversore*, Wittenberg, 1689; E. Pabst: *Meinart, Livlands Apostel*, Reval, 1844-1849.

inaugurated his apostleship among the pagan tribes of the country. One of the chiefs, a certain Caupas, embraced the Christian faith and was baptized. The Lithuanians, however, assailed and destroyed the village of Uxküll. The inhabitants, headed by Meynard, had found a refuge in the surrounding forests. When the Lithuanian warriors disappeared, Meynard went back to the place of the destroyed village, and described to its inhabitants the fortresses of his own country and promised to build up one of them if they were willing to receive baptism. His proposal met with their approval. German architects and masons went to Uxküll at the request of Meynard and erected a church and a fortified castle. The new Christians were ungrateful to their apostle and pastor and relapsed into idol worship. The same occurred when the inhabitants of Holm, a small island of the Dwina, were taught by him to build fortresses on condition that they also receive baptism. A church was built there in honor of St. Martin, and the Zemgalians tried to destroy it and to dismantle the castle protecting it.

The rhymed chronicle alleged to be the work of Ditleb of Alnpeke has preserved the details of a visit of Meynard to Rome in order to render account of his mission to the Pope. Cupas was his companion en route. The Pope welcomed both visitors, and granted all their requests. Meynard explained to him the necessity of raising the mission to the grade of bishopric. The Pontiff replied with a smile: "Dear Meynard, you will be the first Bishop of that see. You will choose other missionaries as your fellows, and take jurisdiction over the land of the pagans, and be invested with great authority."

Meynard received his consecration at the hands of Hartwig II., Archbishop of Bremen, and returned to the field of his apostleship. We lack details as to his apostolic labors. But the chronicler praises his charity. He passed his last years aiding the poor and teaching his flock. He died on August 14, 1196. His mortal remains were buried in the church of Uxküll, whence they were transferred to the Cathedral of Riga in the fourteenth century. Livonia hails him as the apostle of her people.⁵ But Lithuanian and Lettish historians, while doing justice to his zeal and virtue, lament the fact that his collaborators aimed to establish German domination over their coun-

⁵ The name of Meynard appears in the *Acta Sanctorum* among the *praetermissi*. On his devotion, see Hermann Bruiningh: *Die Frage der Verehrung der ersten livländischen Bischöfe*; also Heilige, *Sitzungsberichte der Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Altertumskunde der Ostseeprovinzen Russlands*, Riga, 1902, pp. 3-36; Id.: *Messe und Kanonisches Stundengebet nach dem Brauche der rigaschen Kirche im späteren Mittelalter*, *Mittheilungen of the Historical Society of Livonia*, XIX., Riga, 1904; W. Heine: *Hagiologisches aus Act Livland*, *Der Katholik*, 1903-1905. *Die Landesaposteln Livlands in der kirchlichen Verehrung*, *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, 1905, T. LXVIII., pp. 353-360.

try. The conversion to Christianity was alleged to be a mere pretext for the satisfaction of their ambition.⁶

The successor of Meynard was the warlike Bishop Berthold, Abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Lokkum (Hanover). His episcopal consecration took place in 1194. Berthold used rather the violence of the conqueror than the mildness of the apostle. To punish the apostasy of the Livonians, who had been baptized by Meynard, he preached a crusade against them, and gathered an army. Warriors came to him from Saxony, Westphalia and Friesland. With his little army he waged war against his enemies on the plain where his successor had laid the foundations of Riga. The chance of battle turned in favor of the Germans; but Berthold, pushed into the ranks of his enemies by his high-mettled horse, was transpierced by a spear thrust. "He died for his flock," writes the earliest chronicler of Christian Livonia. His death took place in 1198. The German crusaders avenged him by devastating and pillaging the country. The pagans of Uxküll and Holm embraced the Christian faith and paid tribute to the conquerors, who returned to Germany leaving the missionaries without support. As soon as the soldiers were gone, the pagans murdered the missionaries and their converted countrymen. Among the latter was Caupas, who, when falling stricken with four wounds, exclaimed: "Our Lord received for me five wounds: I regret that only four were inflicted on my body."

Albert of Buxhövdén (or according to others, of Appledern), was the third Bishop of Livonia. Henry the Lett furnishes, in his chronicle, rather full information as to his life. In spite of the familiar name given him, Henry was a German priest, who, until 1208, was doing missionary work in Livonia, and who was well acquainted with the Lettish and Esthonian languages. He witnessed most of the events related in his chronicle, which, of course, is written in the uncouth Latin of the Middle Ages. The chronicle starts with the life of Meynard and stops in 1227, two years before the death of Albert (January 17, 1229). William, Bishop of Modena, and Legate of the Holy See in Livonia in 1225, exhorted him to undertake his literary work, which contains the Christian epic of Latvia. We do not know why the writer, who was still alive and pastor at Papendorfer in 1259,⁷ did not go farther in his narrative.

⁶ On the origin and early history of Livonian Christianity see: Nachrichten über einige der ersten Bischöfe im Livland und Estland, Mainz, 1843; E. Metzner: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Einführung des Christentums im Preussen, Graudenz, 1906. C. Turowski, Kirchengeschichte von Ost und Westpreussen, I. I. Gotha, 1908; F. Schonebohm: Die Besetzung der livländischen Bistümer bis zum Anfang des XIV. Jahrhunderts, Giessen, 1909.

⁷ L. Arbusow: Geschichte Livlands, Riga, 1908, p. 74; H. Hildebrand: Die Chronik Heinrichs von Lettland, Berlin, 1865. The title of the Chronicle is as follows: Origines Livoniae Sacrae, seu chronicon livonicum vetus, in Scriptores rerum livonicarum, Riga and Leipzig, 1853; A. Potthast: Bibliotheca historica medii oevi, T. I., 1895, pp. 583-584.

Bishop Albert was wholly saturated with the spirit of the crusaders. He felt that the sword must be brandished against the infidels. He sought to destroy, by violence if need be, the pagan temples. After his consecration, he gathered in the island of Gotland a small army of five hundred warriors. Canute, King of Denmark; Waldemar, Grand Duke of Schleswig; Absalom, Archbishop of Lund, were persuaded to assist him. Innocent III. (1198-1216) encouraged him to preach the crusade against the pagans of his diocese. In April, 1200, twenty-three ships loaded with warriors and arms went up the Dwina, and landed at Holm, where they found the few missionaries who had taken shelter there after withdrawing from Uxküll, and were heroically withstanding the onslaught of the pagans. Albert discovered a suitable site for a fortification at the mouth of one of the tributaries of the Dwina, a place suitable to serve as a harbor. Here a wooden church was erected. It was soon destroyed by fire, but rebuilt of stone in 1215. This chapel later became the Cathedral of Riga.⁸

Some historians believe that the founder of this city was Berthold. According to Arnold of Lübeck, Riga was founded by Meynard in 1186 and placed under the patronage of the Blessed Virgin. Whoever may have been the founder of Riga, it is true that Bishop Albert was its first and active organizer from both the religious and the temporal point of view. It was he who summoned the first settlers, who went there under the guidance of a canon regular of St. Augustine. Foreseeing the commercial importance of the harbor, he obtained from Rome Papal Bulls forbidding the Germans to carry on their trade with the other ports of the Baltic coasts. Merchants were granted privileges and exemptions by the town. The town grew so rapidly that in the year 1213 Innocent III. withdrew it from the spiritual jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Bremen and proclaimed it an autonomous episcopal see.⁹

The pagans began to molest the rising city. Their hatred of their German conquerors became hatred of the Christian religion. Under Albert, many converted pagans suffered martyrdom. The most illustrious of these champions of the faith were Cyranus and Laianus, who died under excruciating torment.¹⁰ To protect the

⁸ K. H. Busse: *Erörterungen über die Geschlechtsnamen des bishofs Albrecht von Riga*, Mittheilungen, etc., T. IV., 1849, pp. 3-56; E. Winkelmann: *König Philipp von Deutschland und Bischof Albert von Livland*; *Ibid.*: T. IX., pp. 76-102; C. E. Napiersky: *De diplomate quo Albertus, episcopus Livoniae declaratur princeps imperii romano-germanici, num authenticum sit et quo anno datum*, Riga, 1832; *Id.*, *Riga's ältere Geschichte in Uebersicht, Urkunden und alten Aufzeichnungen*, Riga, 1844; A. Bulmerincz: *Die Verfassung der Stadt Riga im ersten Jahrhundert der Stadt*, Leipzig, 1898.

⁹ W. Bippen: *Geschichte der Stadt Bremen*, Bremen, 1892, T. I., pp. 123-124.

¹⁰ Arbusow: *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

nascent centre of Christian endeavor and influence, Albert made up his mind to transform the temporary military status of his ecclesiastical province into a permanent military system. The crusaders he had enrolled had been accustomed to return to Germany, after one year's service in the ranks. In order to attach them to the soil of Livonia, he conceived the plan of instituting a religious order, whose members might in the course of time be the means of leading all the non-Christian inhabitants to receive baptism.

It would seem that the first one to have suggested the establishment of a new military order was Theodoric of Treiden, a Cistercian, who in the days of Meynard had displayed great zeal for the conversion of the pagans. Nevertheless, the first to give it effect was Albert, who evolved a rule, and encouraged the formation of an order under it. The order was based substantially on the way of living and customs of the Templars. They were called the "Brothers of the Militia of Christ, or Knights of the Sword." They took the vow of chastity, professed obedience to the Bishop, and upon oath promised to take up arms against the infidels.¹¹ The cloak bore, as their distinctive design, a red sword on the left side, and the sword had the same emblem graven on the hilt. Innocent III. approved the establishment of the order and decided that the lands they might conquer would belong to them and the Bishop of Riga.¹² The Knights of the Sword claimed a half of the territory they might conquer, but the Pope granted them only a third. The pretensions of the Knights increased after the death of Bishop Albert, and gave occasion to frequent strife between them and the clergy of Riga.¹³

The first master of the Order was Wenno or Winno, who in 1209 was murdered by Wibbert of Soest, an ex-knight.¹⁴ Between 1207 and 1229 the life of Albert was a series of battles, travels and efforts to convert to the Christian faith the pagan tribes of the Baltic, and maintain the German hegemony over them. In 1205, the Lithuanians under the command of Svelgat besieged Riga, and invaded Esthonia. The Livonian Knights routed them and killed their chief. In 1204,

¹¹ C. E. Napiersky: *Sylva documentorum*, T. I., Riga, 1833, p. 372.

¹² *Origines Livoniae*, pp. 96-98.

¹³ A. Hornung: *Dissertatio de ordine qui dicitur ensiferorum*, Wittenberg, 1685; H. L. Schurzbleich: *Historia ensiferorum Ordinis Teutonici Livonorum*, Wittenberg, 1701; Th. Kallmeyer: *Die Begründung deutscher Herrschaft und christlichen Glaubens in Kurland Während des XIII. Jahrhunderts*, Riga, 1859; S. Solovev: *Krestonowtzy, i Litva (The Crusaders and Lithuania)*, *Otecestvennyia Zapiski*, Moscow, 1862, T. LXXXII., pp. 43-62; C. E. Napiersky: *Deutsche Chronik der Schwerdtbrüder und der Brüder des deutschen Hauses in Livland*, *Archiv für die Geschichte Liv., Esth. und Kurlands*, Dorpat, 1856, T. VIII., pp. 66-82.

¹⁴ H. Brackel: *Die Ermordung des ersten livländischen Ordensmeisters Herrn Winno*, *Mittheilungen*, T. III., Riga, 1845, pp. 187-9, 230; A. Gernet: *Die Anfänge der livländischen Ritterschaften*, Reval, 1895.

Albert preached a new crusade against the pagans. Because of his service to the cause of Christianity and to German influence, the Bishop was named a prince of the Holy Roman Empire. In 1211, the Curiones visited the tribes of Esthonia and Zemgalia to join them in crushing the power of Germany. Riga was in great danger. The hordes of pagans had reached its walls. The inhabitants were awakened by the ringing of the bells of alarm, and they withstood the assaults of the enemy until the Knights reached the city of Uxküll and other castles. The battle raged three days. At last, the pagans were driven back, and forced to retire with great loss. To commemorate the victory and the defense of Riga, the thirteenth day of July was dedicated to the feast of St. Margaret.

In the same year, Albert gathered a new army of Germans, and inaugurated a systematic war against the pagans. The Bishops of Ratzeburg, Verdun and Paderborn accompanied him in his campaign. Many pagans were forced to embrace the Christian faith. The progress of Christianity among the Esthonians led the Holy See to create a new diocese at Leal. Its first Bishop was Theodoric of Treiden. A third diocese was that of Zemgalia, whose first Bishop, Bernard (1218-1224), assumed the title of *episcopus selonicensis*.

An act of political imprudence on the part of Albert in 1218 made conditions in Livonia rather worse, and caused dissension among the Germans and Danes.¹⁵ In 1218, the Archbishop of Bremen closed the harbor of Lübeck to the commerce of the Baltic. This measure prevented German crusaders from reaching Livonia. Albert, who was in constant fear of a renewal of pagan aggression, with Bishops Theodoric and Bernard, went to the court of Waldemar, King of Denmark, and asked him for help. The King, who coveted the island of Oesel, complied immediately with his request.¹⁶ A Danish army landed on the coast of Livonia, and built the fortress of Reval. The Germans got on badly with the newcomers and clashed with them. They were beaten and their foes conquered Esthonia. The feeling of the Germans against Waldemar became so deep that they plotted his murder. But Bishop Theodoric was mistaken for the King and stabbed by the conspirators, on June 15, 1219. Albert arranged that the vacant see should be filled by his brother Herman. Almost at the same time, Waldemar succeeded in making a supporter of his, Wescelinus, Bishop of Reval (1219-1227).

The Danish missionaries strove to penetrate the interior of the

¹⁵ C. Crözer: *Bischof Albert und sein Werk*, Petrograd, 1862; W. Wolterup: *Dänemarks Beziehungen zu Livland vom Verkaufe Estlands bis zur Auflösung des Ordensstaates*, Berlin, 1883.

¹⁶ A. A. Blagoviesshensky: *Ostrov Ezel (the Island of Oesel)*, Petrograd, 1881, pp. 14-22.

conquered territory, while the Germans did their best to keep them away from their lost province.

Weighed down by both factions, the Esthonians waged war firstly against the Danes, and drove them from their fortresses. Then they turned against the Germans, who massed their forces and hurled them against the pagans. After a most desperate resistance, the city of Dorpat fell into their hands. In 1226 the Knights of the Sword seized the island of Oesel, and in 1228 Albert laid the foundation there of an episcopal see, and he later consecrated as its first Bishop, Gotfried, a Cistercian abbot. On January 17, 1229, the zealous Bishop died and was buried in the Cathedral of Riga.¹⁷

One important episode of the career of Albert was his request for a Papal Legate who might visit the new Christian provinces. Honorius III. acceded to his petition, and in 1225 sent as Legate William of Savoy, Bishop of Modena. His name is often called to our attention as we review the early history of the Baltic Christianity. He lived in Livonia two years (1225-1226) and returned there in 1234-1235, and again in 1238. He was a man of wide experience, well balanced judgment and rare diplomatic ability. In his travels through Livonia and Esthonia, he became perfectly acquainted with the customs and character of the population, and the requirements of the situation. His prudence and foresight enabled him to solve satisfactorily many important questions. He visited the castles of Wenden and Trikalen, while in Uxküll, he celebrated the commemoration of the earliest apostles of Livonia. He visited the Danish fortresses of Gerwen and Wierland and those on the island of Oesel. His mission ended, he returned to Rome, leaving as his vicar a missionary named John. William is remembered also as the first writer in the Baltic languages, because of his translation into old Prussian of the grammar of Donatus.¹⁸

The death of Albert may be taken as a convenient date for the origin of the religious and political hegemony of the Germans in Livonia. Rarely did the order act out of unselfish and supernatural motives. His undertakings were suggested by the love of conquest. His action was rather harmful than favorable to the interests of Livonian Catholicism. The wars waged against them by Livonian paganism were inspired by a love of freedom and resistance to a foe seeking to deprive Livonia of its independence. The Livonian Knights who took part in these wars were imperialists of the same

¹⁷ J. Brodsneeks: *Katolubasniza Liwonija* (Catholicism in Livonia), in *Lettish, Austrums* (The East), Riga, 1894, III., pp. 231-237.

¹⁸ C. Schirren: *Verzeichniss liveländischer Geschichts-quellen in schwedischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, Dorpat, 1861, nn. 3-7; Fr. Krosta: *Willelm von Modena als Legat von Preussen, Königsberg*, 1867; P. Balan: *Sulle legazioni compiute nei paesi nordici da Guglielmo vescovo di Modena nel secolo XIII.*, Modena, 1872.

restless type that we have seen pushing forward the frontier outposts of military States, from the earliest period in recorded history down to our own day. Upon their pretensions rest the German claims to the Baltic provinces.

Let us hope that the political resurrection of Latvia may be followed with but little delay by her return to the faith of her people of seven centuries ago. The brilliant Catholic records of more than four centuries cannot be erased from the annals of the Lettish people and they constitute a tradition which ought not be discredited. The liberated Letts ought not forget how much the Lutheranism of their German aristocracy has stifled their national development. It may be that they already feel a homesickness for their deserted Catholic sanctuaries.

A. PALMIERI, O. S. A., Ph. D., D. D.

Philadelphia, Pa.

MEDIÆVAL LATIN PROVERBS.

PROVERBS have from the earliest times created a literature of their own. They have been the seed from which a plentiful crop of books has been reaped, from the days of Aristotle and Plato, both of whom made collections of them, to our own time, when most modern nations have produced works on parœmiology. No literature is richer in proverbs than that of Spain, and it was a Spaniard who gave us one of the best definitions of a proverb. Cervantes said it was "a short sentence founded on a long experience," a description it would be difficult to beat. But if Spanish literature is adorned with proverbs on almost every page (they spring up like daisies on a lawn), it is Germany that has created the largest literature about proverbs. To mention only a few of these works: two of the best known works on the comparative science of proverbs are first, a collection of German proverbs in five volumes published by Karl Wander in 1863-1880, called a *Lexicon*; and second, a collection of proverbs in the German and Romance languages in two volumes by Ida and Otto von Düringsfeld, published in 1872-1875.

The earliest English collection was made by Ray in 1670; this has been reissued and enlarged in Bohn's "English Proverbs." Many proverbs are almost universal, they occur in most countries in varied forms, the idea is the same but it is clothed in a different dress according to the genius of the country in which it occurs. This is naturally true in neighboring countries, where the proverb, like an escape from a garden, will vary according to the soil on which it falls.

Of more ancient collections, there was one made by a Dutchman, Albert Schott, published in Antwerp in 1612: it contained 358 proverbs from the Vatican Library, a large number of metrical proverbs from various sources; 1,400 were from Suidas, 550 from Zenobius, or Zenodotus, who lived in the second century of our era, and 775 collected by Diogenianus, a contemporary of Zenobius.

In the middle of the fifteenth century, Michael Apostolius, of Constantinople, made a large collection, and wrote explanations of them. Then Erasmus collected over four thousand, mostly from classical authors; he published them under the name of "*Adages*," and it became one of his most popular works. He described a proverb as "*a well-known saying remarkable for some elegant novelty*," to which definition we much prefer that of Cervantes, quoted above, or Lord John Russell's "the wisdom of many and the wit of one." Better is the definition attributed to Aristotle by an early Christian writer, Synesius, to this effect: "A proverb is a remnant of

the ancient philosophy preserved amid very many destructions, on account of its brevity and fitness."

Although very many proverbs contain moral instruction, yet this is by no means essential to them; indeed some of the wittiest are devoid of it. They adapt themselves easily to cynicism; for example, "Every man has his price," which, be it noted, is the original form of this proverb, though not the one usually quoted.

The collection we propose to examine here is made by a German writer, Jakob Werner, and needless to say that being of German origin it is thoroughly and systematically done: it is a collection made from MSS. of the Middle Ages. The sources are MSS. in the universities and public libraries of Basle, Darmstadt and Munich, the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris and the monastic library of St. Gall.

One MS. in the University of Basle is a collection of two-line proverbs made by a Carthusian monk; another is a MS. of one-line proverbs collected from classical writers. The editor has omitted some long verses on woman and coins, both rather favorite subjects. The Darmstadt MSS. contain various fragments collected by one Galfridus; some sheets contain proverbs only in the Latin language; one MS. was filled with German songs and melodies. The Munich MSS. from the Court Library contained certain proverbs versified from divers Latin philosophers. The Paris Bibliothèque Nationale yielded a MS. containing 189 proverbs with the title, "Proverbial Verses," made by one Ysengrimuis, which the editor says greatly resembles a collection at Oxford made by Serlo of Wilton.

In the collection from St. Gall is a MS. by Alanus de Lisle, the philosopher and theologian (1114-1202), with a commentary by him. One page contains the following lines in Latin:

"O writer cease because your hand is tired."

"Three fingers write but all the body labors."

"O gentle Mary, do not leave the writer."

Another MS. by Theobald, a physiologist, contains seventy-seven Latin proverbs with their German equivalents. The Public Library at Munich yielded a MS. with 220 proverbs collected by the Bavarian philosopher and philologist, Akad Wiss. The usual form of all these proverbs is the hexameter and the distich and they generally have one or two syllable rhymes which are not always pure; some are leonines. Some of the proverbs are from classical authors, as Æsop, Ovid, Cato, Marcus Aurelius, Pamphilus, the Ethics of Facetus. In later times Abelard contributes to the collection.

The proverbs deal with all manner of things, but especially with animals: the wolf, the dog, the ass, the mouse, the hare, the fox, the horse all frequently occur; of birds the cock and the hen are the

most popular. Woman is a favorite topic, but she need not look to these pages for flattery. Death is more frequently dealt with than life. Love, friends and friendship are all popular subjects: the elements of water and fire are represented; bread, wine, fish and fruit all figure; of the virtues, patience and honor are mentioned; wisdom has fewer proverbs allotted to it than fools; coins and money are often dealt with and the verb to give is the most popular of all subjects. Manners and customs, masters and servants, the rich and the poor, home, fortune and doctors are other popular themes with the old mediæval proverb makers and collectors.

The use of proverbs for titles of plays by Spanish dramatists and occasionally by our own Shakespeare has been developed in France by making a proverb the basis of a drama, as in several of Alfred de Musset's plays, *e. g.*: "On ne se badine pas avec l'amour"; and it is certain that some proverbs do contain the nucleus of a dramatic plot, as in "All's well that ends well."

Perhaps the most interesting fact in connection with proverbs is the way in which the same proverb varies in different countries. For example, the proverb, "God helps those who help themselves," is almost universal and has many variations, some very pithy: the Greeks say: "Pray not to God with folded hands"; the Spaniards, "God helps the early riser"; the Bulgarian version is, "God will give, but He won't carry home for you"; the Basques say, "God is a good worker, but He likes to be helped"; the French say, "Qui se remue Dieu l'adjue"; the Germans say, "Help yourself and God will help you"; the Danes say, "God gives every bird its food, but He does not throw it into the nest"; the Dutch version is similar to the Danish: "God gives food to those birds who fly for it." The Latin version in one of the Basle MSS. is, "God gives the calf, but He does not hold it by the horn."¹

The old Latin saying from one of the Basle MSS., "I prefer one present to five future (things)" is a very tame edition or root of our "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush," which had variations in Dutch, Italian and Portuguese proverbs. The Dutch say: "Better a bird in the hand than ten in the air"; the Portuguese version is, "Better a sparrow in the hand than two flying"; the French say, "A sparrow in the hand is better than a crane on the wing."

But we are here more concerned with mediæval Latin proverbs than with their equivalents in other countries, of which no doubt they were the root. We may gain an idea of their attitude towards animals from their proverbs about them. For instance, they had evidently no sentimental notions about dogs, as a proverb from the Basle collection shows: "Wash and comb a dog, he is a dog and re-

¹ "Dat Deminus vitulum, sed non cornu tenet illum."

mains one."² That they kept fierce house-dogs in those far-off days we know, as their proverbs prove: "A dog always shows animosity in his own domain,"³ is from a Basle MS. "In his own home the dog is master of everything,"⁴ was the experience of the monks of St. Gall. "In his own house the dog is the bravest of all,"⁵ is another saying from the Basle collection. "Every one has a fierce dog in his yard,"⁶ is from Munich. "No one fears the dog who barks before he bites,"⁷ from Basle, resembles our "A barking dog does not bite," which the Italians and Spaniards also say. A two-line proverb from Basle says: "An old dog does not bark without a cause and the words of the prudent are accustomed to have weight."

The monks of St. Gall had no illusions about precocious sanctity, for they said: "An angelic youth becomes a demon in his old age";⁸ a Basle MS. contains a similar sentiment: "An angel in a boy makes Satan in an old man";⁹ and a Munich MS. has the same idea: "An angel in youth, a demon in his sinking years."¹⁰

The mediæval opinion of woman was a very poor one, as shown forth in proverbs. "A woman rejoices more in beauty than in honesty" is flattering compared with some of their sayings; another mild criticism is embodied in "Words grow where women meet." One from the monastery of St. Gall about women being always prone to the thing forbidden her, we dare not translate in spite of the sop thrown to Cerberus in the third epithet, so we give it in the original: "Femina vas sathane, rose fetens, dulce venenum, semper prona rei qui prohibetur ei." The writers in the Basle collection had no opinion of the gentler sex: "Whoever you are, if you believe in the faith of a woman, believe me, you will be deceived," is the opinion of one who appears to have had some experience in the matter. Another Basle fellow-sufferer says, "If any one tries to find faith in woman let him seek fish in woods, and bees in the sea." St. Gall perpetrated another proverb on woman, which discretion forbids us to translate, though it is fair to the monks to say that the Munich MSS. furnish a very similar one. Here is the St. Gall proverb camouflaged for the unlearned in its native language: "Quid levius flamma? flumen: quid flumine? ventus: Quid vento? mulier: quid mulier? nihil." As the St. Gall proverbs give an insight into the thoughts, trials and experiences of a mediæval monk, we will examine them first, though they do not form a large proportion of Jacob Werner's collection.

² "Ablue, pecte canem, canis est et permanet idem."

³ "Ante suas edes semper canis est animosus."

⁴ "In propriis domibus extat dominus canis semper omnis."

⁵ "In propriis foribus canis est audacior omnis."

⁶ "Unusquisque sua canis audax constat in aula."

⁷ "Nemo canem metuat, qui non ledit, nisi latrat."

⁸ "Angelicus juvenis senibus sathanizat in annis."

⁹ "Angelus in puero fit Satan in senio."

¹⁰ "Angelus est juvenis demon labentibus annis."

Friction between the clergy and the laity are thus dealt with: "When the sea is dry and the devil is raised to the stars, then first will a layman make a faithful friend to a cleric."¹¹ Their servants as well as the laity appear to have been a trial to the clergy, for we find this proverb: "A priest's servant is always tired; when he eats he perspires, and when he works he freezes."¹²

The need to work for a living was evidently a pressing one: witness the following proverb, found also in other collections: "A sleeping cat and a priest neglecting to sing, and an empty pond will bring in little money."¹³ The necessity for labor is also implied in the following: "You cannot catch foxes by wishing to catch foxes."¹⁴

They set a high value on corporal punishment, which the victims probably appreciated less. One of the St. Gall proverbs was to this effect: "When your sons are chastised then they are adorned";¹⁵ with stripes being understood. Another more cryptic version of "Spare the rod and spoil the child," from the same source was a couplet: "Look, father, look at the misfortune of Lucretius, and do not permit your son to go unpunished if you do not wish to lose your nose."¹⁶ The expression, "to lose your nose," was evidently a reference to a common stying, "*abripere nasum mordicus*," equivalent to our "to bite or snap off one's nose." The Lucretius here referred to was probably not the poet, but the patrician Lucretius, the father of Lucretia, whose tragic fate may perhaps be referred to here. A Basle MS. gives a gentle hint of the salutary effect of the rod in "A sharp rod tames untamed boys,"¹⁷ and another proverb from the same source says: "Who spares the rod does not love his children."¹⁸

Besides the St. Gall proverbs another monastic collection was made by the Carthusians, and is preserved in the University Library of Basle, nearly all of these are two-lined and nearly always leonines. The devil was rather a favorite subject with both monasteries. The St. Gall monks hopefully declared that "The devil was dead and hell was sown with rapeseed,"¹⁹ or coleseed, meaning, we suppose, that his kingdom was no longer flourishing. The Carthusian version of our "The devil was ill, the devil a monk would be," etc., was: "The

¹¹ "Dum mare siccatur et demon ad astra levatur,
Tunc primo laicus clero fit, fidus amicus."

¹² "Presbyteri servus est omni tempore lassus
Dum comedat sudat, frigescit quando laborat."

¹³ "Cattus dormitans et clerus cantica vitans,
Et mola stans vacua, tibi dant mala lucra."

¹⁴ "Non sumes vulpes, cupias ad prendere vulpes."

¹⁵ "Cum castigantur pueri tibi: tunc decorantur."

¹⁶ "Lucretii pater casum aspice: non sine natum
Incastigatum, si non vis perdere nasum."

¹⁷ "Indomitos pueros aspera virga domat."

¹⁸ "Qui parcit virgae, pueros non diligit ille."

¹⁹ "Demon mortuus est et tartara sunt sata rapa."

devil when ill wished to be a good monk, but when he was well he remained as he was before,"²⁰ in a leonine verse. The St. Gall monks in a two-line proverb said: "The devil could not pour out more troubles for the clergy, than if he were to give them flocks [literally servants] without any worries."²¹ The Carthusians had a saying that "Where the devil could by no means go himself, there he taught his servants to go." The Germans have a similar saying, but for his servant they substitute an old woman, and the Italians with as much wit as wisdom say: "Where the devil cannot put his head he will put his tail."

The Carthusians had a good many proverbs about wine, one of the few luxuries allowed them by their very strict rule; that they were good judges of it their world-famous liqueur witnesses. We will quote a few of their sayings in this connection: "Good wine makes an old heart young, but bad wine makes a young heart old." The following one shows how highly they prized learning, and their scorn for the unlearned: "Give wine to the learned, boiled water to the layman; let him drink wine who knows how to teach [or compose] Latin."²² The next one shows it would not have been easy to palm off indifferent wine on their cellarer.: "A good buyer tests wine by scent, color and taste: He tests the scent by the nose, the color by the sight and the taste by the mouth."²³

Our proverb that "a hair of the dog that bit him cures the bite," in its cynical sense, has its equivalent in the Carthusian couplet: "Let him drink wine in the morning to renew his empty brain, which yesterday he drowned in the pure juice of the grape,"²⁴ or "in neat wine." The Benedictines of St. Gall said: "If you were able to drink good wine it was good armor,"²⁵ meaning what we call Dutch courage. They also understood the use of wine in cooking, for they said: "A captured fish desires wine, a live one water."²⁶ Fish, although it was the principal food of these monks, was not so popular a subject for proverbs as wine: still they had a few pregnant sayings. The Carthusians said: "The cat loves fish but abhors the river";²⁷ the Italians and Germans have a similar saying, "that the

²⁰ "Demon languebat, monachus bonus esse volebat,
Sed dum convaluit, mansit ut ante fuit."

²¹ "Demon non potuit clero mala fundere plura
Quam quod ei tribuit famulos omni sine cura."

²² "Vinum da docto, layco de flumine cocto:
Ille bibat vinum, qui scit formare Latinum."

²³ "Vina probat bonus emptor odore, colore, sapore,
Nare probatur odor, visu color, et sapor ore."

²⁴ "Vina bibat mane cerebrumque reformat inane,
Quem perfudit heri gratia multa meri."

²⁵ "Est armatura bona, si potes bona vina."

²⁶ "Piscis captivus vinum vult, flumina vivus."

²⁷ "Sumere vult pisces catus, sed flumen abhorret:
Sic sua sepe pigrum, ne crescet, inertia torret."

cat loves fish but hates water." The Carthusians added a second line moralizing on the situation by saying thus by her laziness she does not grow fat. They were very fond of moralizing and many of their proverbs had a double meaning: for example this one: "Who throws a line from the top of a mountain wishing to catch fish: he lies in ambush at a distance."²⁸ Here is evidently a subtle thrust at those who are lukewarm in resisting temptation, or are half-hearted in their work.

The collection of proverbs from which we are quoting was printed at Heidelberg, where they evidently had not a diphthong in their Roman type, which often complicates the meaning, *que* being often used for *quæ*, *hec* for *hæc*, as in the one we are now about to quote. In this proverb there is an allusion to the poet Ovid, whose surname was Naso. "You may say when you suffer and perhaps have not deserved it, that you, another Ovid [Naso] will bear it because you have endured greater things."²⁹ Ovid having suffered the injustice of exile, complicated by the ingratitude of his idol, the Emperor Augustus, by whom he was for some obscure reason, the subject of much speculation ever since, banished to Tomos, on the western coast of the Baltic in Bulgaria, a small town close to the modern city of Constanza, bore trifles with equanimity. The monks of St. Gall, who more rarely than the Carthusians used two-line proverbs, and more rarely still leonine verses, had a two line verse on being despised and despising others:

"Despise no one, despise the world, despise yourself,
Despise being despised, these things are precious to God."³⁰

The good sense of the Carthusians in the matter of fasting and abstinence is seen in the following: "Take food moderately, nature is nourished by a little. Thus refresh the body, lest the mind should grow heavy through fasting."³¹ There is an old English proverb, common to the Italians and Dutch, which says: "Enough is as good as a feast." This being so, prudence suggests that we now bring this banquet of wit and wisdom of the Middle Ages to a close, which we will do in the words of the Carthusians referring to another kind of feast: "When the monks have eaten sufficiently, they rise slowly and sing the Miserere without thought."³²

DARLEY DALE.

Stroud, England.

²⁸ "Qui lini semen supra montem jaculatur,
Piscibus intendens hic eminens insidiatur."

²⁹ "Dicas cum pateris, que forsan non meruisti:
Hec modo Naso feres, quoniam majora tulisti."

³⁰ "Spernere nullum, spernere mundum, spernere sese
Spernere se sperni sunt preciosa Deo."

³¹ "Sume cibum modice: modico natura fovetur:
Sic corpus refove, ne mens jejuna gravetur."

³² "Dum satis est venter monachorum sufficeret
Tunc surgent lente, 'Miserere' canunt sine mente."

IS THE FRENCH SPOKEN IN QUEBEC A PATOIS?

IT IS astonishing how persistingly the idea has held, in the English-speaking mind of Canada, that the French spoken in Quebec is a *patois*. Like many false and absurd ideas that obtain, this erroneous one has had its origin in ignorance of fact. It has trickled through all classes of the English community in Canada, and we have found it existent even in great centres of learning in the United States. Indeed, it will take years, we fear, to disabuse the public mind of this false and absurd idea and give truth of fact its rightful place.

The question, we hold, should be discussed free from all race or language prejudice and supported, not by mere subtle philological distinctions, but by the common sense facts of the laws of language, and the historical truths that underlie all language development.

We must, at the outset, confess that we have never been able to understand why the civilization and development of the French colonist, on the banks of the St. Lawrence, in Canada, should bear fruit in a *patois* of speech, while the English colonists, who first settled in Massachusetts and Virginia, succeeded in preserving the English of Shakespeare or Pope or Addison.

If we make a study of the character of the first French colonists who came to Canada, then called New France, from the beginning of the seventeenth century to the middle of the eighteenth century, there is nothing to warrant us in assuming that the language they spoke was nothing but a synthesis of the dialects that prevailed in their mother country. On the contrary, the intellectual beginnings of New France are cœval with an old France that during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries surpassed, in brilliant literary achievement, in science and in art, all the other countries of Europe.

It is true that many of the French colonists belonged, not to the intellectual élite, but to the toiling masses who necessarily emphasized labor and the skill of the hand rather than the skill of the brain. But this can be said as well of the early settlers in Massachusetts and Virginia. You may here ask: Do we know the character of the early French colonists in Canada? Decidedly we do; and what is more, we know the parts of France from which they hailed, and the character or peculiarities of the language or dialects which they spoke; for there is no doubt that some of them came to our Canadian shores with a dialect upon their tongues. However, the French colonizers were not alone in this. Pray make a study of the early New England and Virginia Colonizers, and witness to the fact that it was not the

approved accent of a Samuel Johnson or some Chesterfieldian Beau Brummel that prevailed on Massachusetts Bay or at Jamestown, Virginia, but a kind of hybrid accent that partook of the mentality of various localized quarters of England, with here and there a bright spangle and dash of the more cultured and elegant Cavalier.

But to return to the French colonizers of Quebec. The first contingent of these, we learn, came chiefly from Perche Normandy, Picardy and Beauce. We are quite certain of this fact. We are further certain that between 1662 and 1672, Poitou La Rochelle and Gascony contributed a contingent. Between 1632 and 1672 Touraine and Paris, with its surrounding country, also contributed a certain part to the peopling of the new colony. In the eighteenth century a few colonists came from Dauphiney, Franche-Comté and Burgundy.

Now the fact to remember, in connection with the colonizing forces that came from France at different epochs from 1608 to 1760, and settled in Quebec is, that Normandy took the lead, contributing in all 958 colonists; and the Ile-de-France, where the very best French spoken in France in the seventeenth century obtained, ranked second with 621 colonists.

But you may ask: How do we know these things? We answer: From Monsignor Janguay's "Genealogical Dictionary of French-Canadian Families," based upon the baptismal and marriage registers of Quebec, and from Benjamin Sulte's "The French Language in Canada."

"It is interesting to note how a particular dialect in a country prevails over all the other dialects; becoming eventually the accepted language of literature and scholars. This is due often to the political prestige of the people who speak the dialect. Notice that the West Saxon dialect of Wessex in England became the literary language of England in the ninth century; the Tuscan dialect the literary language of Italy in the thirteenth century, and a few centuries later the dialect of Castile in Spain prevailed over all the other Spanish dialects and became the literary language of all Spain. Pray note, too, that the dialect of the Ile-de-France took precedence of all the other French dialects as early as the twelfth century—first in official acts and then in literature; and by the fifteenth century the sway of this dialect was so complete that henceforth it became the language of the Court, of the palace and of literature. We thus see that the French literary language had been establishing itself for nearly five centuries in France before the colonists of New France had fixed their homes upon the banks of the St. Lawrence.

Let us examine, furthermore for a moment, what was the intellectual character of France at the time when its bold and hardy adventurers were founding a New France in the New World. We are

now in the age of Louis XIV., the most brilliant century of French genius. Richelieu had founded the French Academy in 1635. It is the age of such scholars as Ducange, Petau, Mabillon; of the painters, Poussin and Le Brun; of such ministers of State as Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert; of the pulpit orators Bossuet, Bourdaloue and Massillon; of the philosophers Pascal and Descartes; of the dramatists Corneille, Racine and Molière.

Think you, then, that in an age such as this, French sent forth from her bosom a body of colonists, paupers in intellect with naught but dialect—conflicting dialect upon their lips? Or, is it not more natural to believe that a goodly number of those who sought the shores of Canada were men and women superior in intellect, and possessing the scholarship and culture or at least a goodly share of that scholarship and culture which gave France of the seventeenth century a first place in intellectual rank among the nations of Europe?

Of course, nobody can or would deny but that many of these colonists from France brought with them a dialect, but the further fact is quite likely that they all could understand and converse in French. And what is more likely, too, than that under the leadership of an educated clergy, professors in the colleges, officers in the army, and members of the medical and legal professions, the first colonists soon learned to discard all *patois*, or provincial dialect, and converse in the French language alone.

In fact, we have proof of this in the testimony of La Potherie and Charleroix, who declared—the first in 1700 and the second in 1720, when writing of the French Canadians—that no provincial accent or dialect was observed among them. Why, we ask, should the French language spoken on the banks of the St. Lawrence, in the seventeenth century, be not as good as the English spoken at the same time in Jamestown, Virginia, or on Massachusetts Bay? Should you answer that the colonists who first settled Virginia and Massachusetts were superior intellectually to those who founded New France, we answer that a large number of the first settlers of Jamestown, Virginia, were convicts; and we do not generally go to convicts for superior intellects or purity of language.

Just look at the early English settlements in America, and see what an *omnium gatherum* you have from the four winds of heaven. Is it probable that the Highland Scotch who settled in the two Carolinas, a part of Georgia and in the Mohawk Valley of New York; the Ulster Irish who settled in Virginia and Pennsylvania; the men and women hailing from Yorkshire and Devonshire and the environs of London, who set up their homes in the New England States; is it probable that they spoke English in accordance with the laws laid down by old Dr. Samuel Johnson, the first of lexicographers? Did

these colonists bring to our shores, whether American or Canadian, any perversity of accent, any dialect, any strange obsolete words? If they did, then is the English of Virginia, New York, Massachusetts and Canada as much a *patois* as is the French of Quebec. One of the most amusing charges, if it were not absurd, made against the French spoken in Quebec is that it is "a Breton jargon." Now, of nearly five thousand emigrants, or if you will colonists, who came from France to Canada between the years 1608 and 1700, only 175 came from Brittany, and surely these could not have imposed their language on the rest.

As a matter of fact, but few Bretons came to Canada, and the greater number of those who did come settled in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, then called Acadia. The Bretons were a seafaring people, and some of their nautical terms exist to-day in the language spoken by the Acadians. Again, the people of Brittany do not speak a jargon; they speak the Breton tongue, which is Celtic and closely resembles the Cymric tongue of Wales.

But the strongest and most conclusive proof that the French of Quebec to-day do not speak a *patois* is found in the fact that every book used in the schools, academies and colleges of that province—that is in the French classes—is written in standard French, and could be used in the schools of France. How then, we ask, can French-Canadian boys and girls acquire their education through the medium of the standard French books and still continue to talk a *patois*? Is not this reducing the charge to an absurdity?

A few years ago the writer was traveling by train from Montreal to Quebec, and engaged in French conversation a French-Canadian commercial traveler, or as he is known in Quebec, a *commis voyageur*. After conversing for an hour, we asked him if he had any difficulty in understanding us. "Not at all," he replied. "Well," we rejoined, "we studied French some years ago in France, Belgium and Switzerland, while you have studied it here in the schools of Quebec.. Of course you are aware," we added, "that the English say you speak a *patois*. Is not our conversation good proof that you speak, not a *patois*, but the standard French—the literary language of France?" The French-Canadian commercial traveler only smiled at the charge made in ignorance by English-speaking people against his countrymen.

A glaring example of this ignorance of fact, on the part of English-speaking people, was revealed some twelve years ago, when there was a great reunion at Plattsburg, N. Y., to celebrate the second centenary of the discovery of Lake Champlain by the discoverer whose name it bears. Among the distinguished personages who attended the celebration and spoke was M. J. J. Jusserand, the

French Ambassador to the United States. After the Ambassador had spoken for some time in English, he added that he would address the French-Canadians assembled there in their own tongue, which was interpreted by the Associated Press to mean, in the "Canadian jargon," as something distinct from the French language.

On the point as to what His Excellency the French Ambassador meant, a dispute arose, that was finally only settled by a letter from the Ambassador, which we here reproduce in translation: "As to the misunderstanding which you point out, permit me to dispose of it in a word. The language of the French-Canadians and that of the French is the same language, being French. I could never have believed that anybody could have been mistaken in the sense of my words, since, when I said to the French-Canadians that I was going to speak their language, I immediately spoke my own, which is theirs. No; no doubt is possible; and I have had too many opportunities to hear their speeches and to talk with them not to be convinced of this: the cradles of Quebec and Montreal and the cradles of Paris, Lyons or Orleans hear fall from maternal lips the same accents, hear the same language—the French of which those who speak it have a right to be proud for a thousand years."

Now a word here as to the character of the French spoken by the *habitant* in Quebec. Let us say that it is quite as good as the English spoken in the country places—in Ontario, Vermont or Indiana, for example. It is better than the French spoken by the country people, or, if you will, *les paysans*, in France.

No doubt, among the country people in Quebec there are many words and phrases still used that belong to seventeenth century French, or that have grown out of new conditions in Canada. But is this not equally true of the English that is spoken among the common people in Canada and the United States? We will wager that a little study would reveal the fact that many English words and phrases, now no longer in use in educated centres, but current in the American colonies two hundred years ago, still are current verbal coin in local corners of Virginia, Vermont, Nova Scotia and Maine.

Take, for instance, the French-Canadian expression heard among the *habitants*, *il fait fret* for *il fait froid*—"it is cold." This expression was commended and defended by the French grammars of the seventeenth century. It is simply then a survival in Canada of seventeenth century French.

It reminds one of the attacks made upon English pronunciation that obtains in Ireland, which is incorrectly designated a *brogue*. As a matter of fact, the Irish pronounce English as it was pronounced in the days of Shakespeare; and this continued even to the time of Alexander Pope, as any one may discover if he will but make a study

of Pope's rhymes. Need we here supplement our defense of the French spoken in Quebec by citing the list of French-Canadian writers in both prose and poetry, whose works have been crowned by the French Academy. Assuredly, the "Forty Immortals" would not lightly give their *imprimatur* to any work not written in the best and purest French. Furthermore, we do not know of any body of scholars, academic or literary, who are doing more to purify their language than "La Societé du Parter Francais" of Quebec. Not alone through their official organ, but in the columns of the French-Canadian daily press, they are casting out all intruding Anglicized words, or words of doubtful French signification. Again, it will be noticed that the French spoken in Quebec is a very copious language, possessing many words that have had origin in the life and conditions of the country and people and of which the French Academy can necessarily know nothing.

In conclusion, let us say that what adds to the absurdity of the criticism leveled in ignorance against the French spoken in Quebec by English-speaking people, in Canada and the United States, is the fact that, generally speaking, those who glibly pass judgment on the French of Quebec, have often not even an elementary knowledge of the language.

THOMAS O'HAGAN, Ph. D., Litt. D.

Toronto, Canada.

Book Reviews

"St. Bernardine of Siena." Sermons Selected and Edited by Don Nazareno Orlandi. Translated by Helen Josephine Robins: Siena, 1920.

St. Bernardine was a great preacher. For about forty-four years he preached almost unceasingly in cities and villages, but more frequently in the piazzas than in the churches. Here multitudes assembled, especially at dawn and sunset, and were carried away by his eloquence. It is claimed that he accomplished as much for the religious life of Italy as St. Catharine did for the political.

In recent years interest in these sermons has grown, and collections of them have been published in various forms. The popular sermons have come down to our time in a curious way. A shearer of cloth was the saint's amanuensis. He took notes with a stylus on wax tablets while the sermons were being preached, and then returned to his shop and made them out on manuscript. As this was probably before the days of shorthand, the task must have been a difficult one, and we do not know how perfectly he succeeded, but judging by the detail that characterizes the sermons in the present collection, and by the intimate tone that runs through them, he must have been pretty accurate.

The present compilation has been made by an Italian pastor of Siena, Don Nazareno Orlandi, who has labored for many years to revise and carry on the work of St. Bernardine. He has devoted his attention especially to the boys and young men, and formed them into organizations that advance their temporal interests, while at the same time safeguarding their faith and morals. Americans staying at Siena have become interested in his work and are making it known. In this way Miss Helen J. Robins, of Philadelphia and Bryn Mawr College, has become the translator of this collection of sermons.

The compiler tells us that "selections have been made which are of moral value to our time and which derive a peculiar charm from the unusual character of the vivid little stories and anecdotes, and the moral fables and illustrations, closely resembling in their sweet simplicity and ingenuous piety the *Fioretti* of the great St. Francis."

St. Bernardine spoke plainly, but this was due to the custom of the times in which he lived, and also to his great zeal. It was permissible in him because of his great sanctity.

The modern preacher must not think that he can preach the sermons of this great fourteenth century saint. To do so effect-

ually, he would have to live in a former age, in another country, and a different life. But the modern preacher can learn from this eloquent son of St. Francis zeal, eloquence, courage, fearlessness, vigor and sincerity, and the modern reader can learn from these sermons the love and fear of God.

"Social Organization in Parishes." By Edward F. Garesché, S. J. 8vo., cloth, net, \$2.75; postage 15 cents. A complete programme of Parochial Social Activities. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Father Garesché here gathers together again matter which has appeared from time to time in the *Queen's Work*. He takes the Blessed Virgin Sodality as the centre of parish activity, and hopes that through it all the various forms of parish activity will come into existence and function. But we fear that it will not be easy to carry this plan into practice. The multiplicity of societies that already exist, each doing some special work, will make it very difficult. We have already St. Vincent de Paul Societies, Holy Name Societies, Total Abstinence Societies, Young Men's Social Organizations, and Young Women's, with their literary, social and athletic features. Add to these the League of the Sacred Heart, and the Knights of Columbus, and the field is pretty well covered. Rightly or wrongly the Blessed Virgin's Sodality has now for a long time been looked upon as a pious organization, whose members meet in the church once a week for the recitation of the Office and receive Holy Communion together once a month. Does not experience show that an organization which tries to do all things, seldom does even one thing well?

Is not this the reason for the multiplication of societies for various works? The book also advises the formation of a union of sodalities. Any one who has had experience with unions will be slow to start another. They are very hard to keep up, and if the Blessed Virgin's Sodality is to continue to be the pious parish organization which it now is and has been for many years in most places, it is not easy to see what practical good a union of sodalities is going to do, or how it is going to be kept alive.

Of course the author says that the sodality has been taken herein for a standard of organization in parishes, schools and institutions as being the most universal in its distribution and the most general in its membership, and that the suggestions made may be easily applied to the work of almost any Catholic society. But this might be questioned.

It is possible to push the question of social activity in the church too far. This is not essentially the work of the church. If the things of time and the things of eternity are too closely united there is danger of confusion, and a loss of the right sense of proportion.

This is a characteristic of Protestantism, which we should take care to avoid.

The author certainly does cover the ground. There is hardly one field of parish activity that is not considered. The book is full of most valuable hints in regard to organization and government. It ought to be most useful in new parishes where societies have not yet been formed, and where unification is more easily accomplished.

"A Mill Town Pastor." The story of a witty and valiant priest. By Rev. Joseph Conroy, S. J. 12mo., cloth, net, \$1.75; postage 15 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The book deals with a pastor from boyhood to priesthood. He is a bright, witty, manly fellow from the beginning to the end. The story shows that the boy is father to the man. It also teaches that the natural man goes before the supernatural. It proves the truth of the saying of Thomas a Kempis that, the habit and the tonsure do not make the man.

As the story follows the hero through school and college and introduces him to us as curate and pastor, with all the crosses and trials and consolations of the ministry, we seem to have met him in the flesh, and we must confess we like him.

"Flame of the Forest." By Constance E. Bishop. 8vo., cloth, net, \$2; postage 15 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Dreamy, glamorous India, the land of temples, wonder-working fakirs, the home of the occult is the locale of this fascinating tale. The author takes us out of the dull, prosaic round of every-day affairs and transports us to the mystic East, where she unfolds a most delightful romance.

The story opens in Pulnaikanal, a town in the hill country, where the widowed Mrs. King lives with her two daughters, Clytie and Jinny. Clytie, clever and forceful, leaves for England to study medicine, although she loves Philip Vaughan, an English police official. Jinny, who remains with her mother, has two suitors, her cousin Frank, and David Hamilton, a famous biologist who has come to India to write his masterpiece.

Clytie returns after the completion of her course, and becomes the court physician to the Rajah of Anemalei. Her love for Philip Vaughan seeming hopeless, she seeks the dangerous aid of native magicians to win him.

How Jinny made her choice, and what tremendous consequences came of it; how Clytie's dabblings in the occult were but the beginning of an enthralling series of events; and how a long-lost son turns up in a most unexpected way, these are but the high lights

of a rare and colorful love story, thoroughly Catholic, written from a fresh and novel viewpoint.

"A Son of the Hidalgos." By Ricardo Leon, Member of La Academia Espanola. Translated by Catalena Paez (Mrs. Seumas McManus). 12mo., pp. 296. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co.

The author of this book is recognized as one of the important writers of Spain at the present time. He has already contributed several interesting books to modern Spanish literature, and the present work is considered one of his masterpieces. It deals with the adventures of a native of Santillana, the town of the famous Gil Blas, from which he went forth to his famous adventures. Indeed the hero of this story is a descendant of the famous adventurer of another day, and like him, he goes forth in quest of the great something which restless souls always see at a distance, but seldom or never attain.

The charm of the book lies principally in its true pictures of a country and a people of a past age, with their traditions and customs, so different from anything that we have, and indeed from most things that Spain has at the present day.

Too much cannot be said in praise of the translation. Mrs. McManus, herself of Spanish origin, has that knowledge of people and language that is most desirable, but rare, and unites to this a mastery of English that form a rare combination.

We are glad to learn that the publishers intend to continue these Spanish translations, and to publish a carefully selected series of the masterpieces of modern Spanish fiction.



for **PERMANENT
CONSTRUCTION**

FRENCH'S CEMENT

1844

For three-quarters of a
century French's Products

1922

have stood for that excellence in manufacture of building materials which guarantee excellence in results. In structures of more than a mere temporary nature it is well to use materials which time has tested and approved.

FRENCH'S CEMENT COLORS

PEERLESS MORTAR COLORS

SAMUEL H. FRENCH & COMPANY
PHILADELPHIA

PAINTS

VARNISHES

BUILDING MATERIALS

PERIODICAL

70778

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

